

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. V.

JULY, 1899.

No. 3

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church; a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
STORMONT & JACKSON,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. V.

JULY, 1899.

No. 3.

THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF LANGUAGE.¹

The larger portion of the work of the society which we are forming to-day will in all probability have to do with the study of language. The scientific study of this branch of human culture, dating as it does but from the beginning of this century, is one of our youngest sciences, and in consequence of its youth must still be engaged chiefly with questions of detail. The problems that will lie before us are *e. g.* such as the cause of the difference in quantity between *pēs* and *pedem*, of the difference of vocalic quality between these and (Doric) *πῶς* and *ποδός*. They are such as the origin of the Greek adverbs like *οὕτω* *οὕτως*,—are they fossil relics of an ablative or an instrumental case? And whence comes the final—*ς*? Or, again, why should the genitive in Greek, the ablative in Latin be used after the comparative? These and similar questions of detail are the ones that confront us, and before they can be approached, preliminary work also of a detailed nature is involved, viz., the exact determination of the usage of the language for the period and the phenomenon in question. For instance, the problem to which I first alluded, the variation in quantity and quality of the vowels in *pēs pedem*, *πῶς ποδός*, and let me add Avestan *fra-bd-a* “the fore part of the foot,” demands as a preliminary for its solution the collection of all such instances of vowel gradation, not only in Latin and Greek, but also in all the kindred languages, the sifting of the material in order to exclude all such instances as Attic *ποός* where the peculiar

¹This paper was originally read before the Philological Association of the Catholic University of America.

vocalic color was called forth by other causes long after those that produced the variation *pês pedem*, πῶς ποδός, *fra-bd-a*, had ceased to act. Only such a collection of material can afford a safe basis for any attempt to solve this problem technically known as the origin of the Indo-European system of "*ablaut*."

Hand in hand with this detail nature of linguistic work goes the necessity for its subdivision. Familiar to all of us are the words of the Roman poet, "*non omnia possumus omnes*." The same lesson is enforced by the author of the Indian Book of Good Counsel, the *Hitopadeça sarvajño nâ 'sti kaç cana*, "no man is a knower of all things." And modern times with their progress, and consequent demands for greater depth and more detail in knowledge, likewise recognize the limitations of our powers, and embody this recognition, in the demands for "specialists" and for "specialization." This subdivision of the work seems at present inseparable from all scientific progress. But subdivision of the work is merely a practical concession to the limitations of our powers and no matter to what extremes it may be carried it cannot affect the concept of the unity of the science. Each scholar may appropriate to himself a certain portion of the field and concentrate upon it his attention, but the results of his labor can be of permanent value only inasmuch as they tend towards the furtherance of the aims of the science as a whole. The specialist will find that in order to prosecute his work with profit he must have, not only a knowledge of those departments that lie closest to his own—a knowledge sufficiently intimate to allow him to pass independent judgment upon the work done and the results achieved in those departments—but also must keep before his mind the goal towards which the science as a whole is working in order to appreciate the value and the bearing of the results of his work upon that object.

Reflections of this nature have brought me to the conclusion that in no way can this society make a better beginning of its work than by considering the objects at which we should aim in the study of language, and the value of the results that we are striving to attain—their value both in themselves and as a help to further progress in other branches of knowledge.

To some of you it may have seemed strange that I have employed in the title of this paper the phrase "The Scientific

Study of Language," and not "Linguistic Science" nor "Philology." A discussion of these terms will make clear my reasons for the choice and at the same time throw light upon the subject of the paper.

In studying a language we may aim at acquiring only the ability to understand—more or less perfectly—thoughts expressed in that language, and to express in that language—with more or less perfection—our own thoughts. Such study of a language is valuable for many purposes but it is practical and not scientific.

By the scientific study of any one language is meant the study of all the phenomena of that language from the point of view of cause and effect from the present time to as remote a period as the material at our command allows that language to be traced. At this point, however, we must note that the only cause that can be given for a linguistic phenomenon is a historical one. The only reason why any given man speaks thus and so is that those from whom he learned to speak, spoke thus and so. The science is a historical one, and the ideal presentation of its results would be a history of the language—a historical grammar—describing with exactness every phenomenon of the language. Such a presentation must, however, always suffer from the difficulties or, if you will, the defects under which the historical presentation of any complex process must labor. It must vary in minuteness of detail according to the amount of material available, and it must present successively events that happened contemporaneously. Grammar, like history, should be written in parallel columns, and the reader should have more eyes than Argus to follow all simultaneously.

To historical is often opposed comparative Grammar, though the opposition is more apparent than real, consisting in such a modification of method as is rendered unavoidable by the different nature of the material. The student of a modern language, that has behind it a long period of development, the records of which have been well preserved, can generally find in the records of the earlier periods the reasons for the linguistic phenomena of the present. But as the student goes farther and farther back, as the records become more and more imperfect and scanty they fail more and more to give with

completeness the causes for the phenomena of the period under investigation. Until finally when the earliest historical period is reached, the period at which the records begin, the student finds that he has no longer any direct evidence for a still earlier period in which he can search for an explanation of the earliest monuments of the language. Such a period can however often be reconstructed by the aid of the kindred languages, and thus a historical reason can be given for the phenomena of the earliest historical period, which we would otherwise have to accept as ultimate facts. Thus the student of modern English may trace its progress backwards step by step through middle English to the Anglo-Saxon of *Beowulf*. At that point the records fail, but a comparison of the other Germanic languages enables him to reconstruct a still earlier period—Proto-Germanic—of the language out of which Anglo-Saxon developed. A comparison of this Proto-Germanic with Latin, Greek, Avestan, Sanskrit, and the other kindred languages leads to the reconstruction of the language of a still earlier period—the Indo-European.

Thus we see that there is no fundamental difference between historical and comparative grammar—the object of each is the same, to trace the history of the development of a given language. Only in one case the student has the materials for his history furnished to him directly by documents of the language, in the other he is obliged to rely for his material upon inferences drawn from an examination of the related languages. Practically the union between the two is even closer; the comparative grammarian must know the history of the different languages with which he deals, while no historian of any language can afford to ignore completely its kindred, although as I have already indicated, the need of their help will be felt most keenly in the earliest period and less and less as the period through which the language has already lived grows longer.

But this does not yet exhaust the field of the scientific study of language. So far we have been speaking of the phenomena of an individual language or of individual languages; over and above these are the problems of language itself. In the words of Paul,¹ "the history of languages like

¹ *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Introd. p. XXI, of Strong's translation.

every other branch of the science of history, has running parallel with it a science which occupies itself with the general conditions of the existence of the object historically developing and investigates the nature and operations of the elements which throughout all change remain constant."

To this is given the name *Linguistic Science* or the *Science of Language*. It was because of my intention to speak, not only of this science, but also of historical and comparative grammar that I employed for the title of this paper not *Linguistic Science*, nor the *Science of Language*, but the *Scientific Study of Language*.

Language is perhaps the greatest of man's achievements, and is certainly the most efficient tool that he has employed in working out his civilization. The study of the general conditions of its existence may well, therefore, be an object of study for its own sake, and is a necessary preliminary for the employment of linguistic phenomena to throw light upon psychological processes. Lack of time, however, forbids my speaking of this, and I will confine myself to what is of more importance for our present purpose, the bearing of *Linguistic Science* upon the study of any one language, whether from the point of view of comparative or historical grammar. That a man who is endeavoring to trace the causal connection between the different recorded phenomena of any language, and to reconstruct as far as possible those links in the chain for which we have no record—that such a man must know the general conditions under which language exists and develops—the nature of the factors at work in this development, their mode of operation and the effects which they can produce, is a proposition that would seem to be self-evident. Yet, curiously enough there has been, and in some quarters still is, a neglect of if not a positive antipathy for linguistic science—for so-called methodological questions. Common sense, or at the most, general logic, it is pleaded, is a sufficient guide. The refutation of such a plea is to be found in the history of modern grammar showing as it does on the one hand the many errors through which men groped for years before the right method was evolved, and on the other the progress of recent years which is in a large measure due to the influence exerted

by the clear formulation of principles contained in Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*.

No one has expressed more strongly than Whitney, his conviction of the necessity of the study of the general principles of linguistic science. He says: ¹"It can hardly admit of question that at least so much knowledge of the nature, history, and classifications of language as is here presented ought to be included in every scheme of higher education, even for those who do not intend to become special students in comparative philology. Much more necessary of course is it to those who cherish such an intention. It is, I am convinced, a mistake to commence at once upon a course of detailed comparative philology with pupils who have only enjoyed the ordinary training in the classical or modern languages, or in both. They are liable either to fail of apprehending the value and interest of the infinity of particulars into which they are plunged, or else to become wholly absorbed in them, losing sight of the grand truths and principles which underlie and give significance to their work, and the recognition of which ought to govern its course throughout; perhaps even coming to combine with acuteness and erudition in etymological investigation views respecting the nature of language and the relation of languages of a wholly crude or fantastical character."

To this I may add the words of Brugmann: ²"Man pflegte den angehenden Jüngern der classischen und der germanischen philologie früherhin den Rat zu ertheilen, ihre Sprachstudien mit dem Erlernen des Sanskrit zu beginnen. Ich unterschätze die Wichtigkeit des Sanscritstudiums keineswegs und möchte nicht das dasselbe aus dem Studienplane dieser Philologen gestrichen werde. Aber wichtiger für die sprachwissenschaftliche Ausbildung erscheint mir dass der Philologe und zwar der Philologe jedweder Gattung, zunächst eine Vorlesung zu hören bekomme, in der er über das Wesen der Sprache und ihrer Entwicklung orientiert wird, damit er befähigt werde in allem, was die Sprache betrifft, wirklich wissenschaftlich zu denken und die Dinge so zu schauen wie sie sind. Je weiter er dieses Studium hinausschiebt, um so schwerer wird es ihm sich den durch die Macht der Gewohnheit gross gezogenen Fundamentalirrtümern zu entwinden."

¹ *Language and the Study of Language*, Preface, p. vii.

² *Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissenschaft* p. 40, sq.

The lack of training in linguistic science is, if not fatal to the accuracy of detail investigation, liable to vitiate any attempt at scientific combination of the facts so determined. And even if the investigator under the guidance of general logic or common sense reaches correct conclusions, the defect in his training will make itself felt in his inability to account satisfactorily for the method of investigation that he has followed.

Turning now from the consideration of the science of language to the scientific, *i. e.*, the historical study of any language, we may first raise the question, with what other branches of science is it to be classed? Delbrück tells us (*Einleitung in das Sprachstudium*, p. 44) that it is his belief that if the question had been put to Schleicher--the great scholar whose work marks the close of the first and the beginning of the second epoch of comparative grammar--in what did the merit of his work consist, he would have replied in the application of the methods of the natural sciences to linguistic science. His contemporaries however did not share these views, and at present it is held that linguistic science is not one of the natural sciences, but is to be classed with those pursuits that we term philological.

"Philology," however, and "philological" are terms that have caused much discussion.¹ Into this discussion I have no intention of going. Boeckh's definition of the term is the one that is characterized by the greatest breadth of view, and is in a modified form the one that probably meets at present with the widest acceptance.² According to this the problem for philology is to investigate and to portray historically the activity of the human mind, that is the development of human civilization. The spirit of a people manifests itself in various ways in their language, in their customs and laws, in their literature, their science, their art, in their mode of public and private life. The object of philology is to trace the development of civilization in all its branches, at all times, and among all peoples--in short, it together with psychology and anthro-

¹ Cf. Paul, *Begriff und Aufgabe der germanischen Philologie*, *Grundriss der germ. Phil.* I², p. 8.

² Cf. Paul, *l. c.*, p. 1 ff.; Brugmann, *Zum heutigen Stand d. Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 7; Hirt, *Sprachwissenschaft und Geschichte*, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte, und Deutsche Litteratur und für Pädagogik* I, 485

pology constitutes the study of man—"the proper study of mankind."

The study of language then is but one part of philology, the object of which is to reproduce for ourselves the achievements of the human mind, and not merely to reproduce them but to discover the causal connection between them. The study of language is aided by all the other branches of philology, and contributes in turn to each of them. To show the interrelations that exist between all the branches would lead too far, so I will confine my attention to the branch that is most widely separated from the study of language—namely, to history.

The direct service that language gives to the historian is evident, inasmuch as an indispensable requisite for the employment of any document is a knowledge of the language in which it is composed. But what I wish to call your attention to at present is the large body of facts of historical importance, for which we have no direct record, that are known to us or are still to be ascertained only through inferences drawn from language, or for which we have records indeed, but records the accuracy of which would be open to question if it were not for the confirmatory evidence of language.

Modern grammar begins with the establishment of the Indo-European family of languages, with the proof that the Aryan language of India, the languages of Persia, Armenia, Phrygia, Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, of the Illyrian, Italic, Keltic, Teutonic, and Balto-Slavic peoples are all descendants from one common language. It holds that there was an Indo-European language, an Indo-European people—though not necessarily an Indo-European race, and that this people had spread its language and its civilization over the territory indicated above, to a great extent at least, before the beginning of our records. In part this was a confirmation of previous ideas, in part a revolution of them. Language had separated what before was supposed to be united, and had pointed out connections that had not been dreamed of previously. But this fact, which was revealed by language alone, remains undisputed and forms the background for the histories of these peoples, that is, for the history of the most important part of the civilized world.

Other questions arise from this at once. From what point did this dispersion of the Indo-Europeans take place? What was the method of this dispersion? With what peoples did the Indo-Europeans come in contact, and with what results? These are all historical questions and in all of them the study of language is the leader, assisted by whatever information ancient writers have transmitted to us.

The belief that was at first prevalent that the dispersion had taken place by a series of divisions and sub-divisions that could be neatly represented by a genealogical tree was overthrown by Johannes Schmidt,¹ and since then the conviction that the process was an exceedingly complicated one has been steadily gaining ground.² Kretschmer (p. 56, ff.), discusses the problem of the original home of the Indo-Europeans, and reaches the conclusion that at the period represented by the reconstructed language they must have extended over the long but narrow strip of land that extends from France, eastward through the whole of central Europe to the steppes of Russia and Siberia; that at a still earlier period they may have occupied only a portion of this territory is not denied, but for the solution of that question we must, according to Kretschmer, look chiefly to prehistoric archæology. That the study of language will have nothing more to do with this question which it was the first to raise, I am loath to believe, and I may call attention to the most recent indication of an attempt at such a solution of the problem, that of Hirt in his article already cited.³

It is to language, too, that we must look for our knowledge of the relations of these peoples in the prehistoric period. The information thus obtained is important, and the points of union and diversity shown are, if not surprising, at any rate such as could not have been divined without the aid of language. For instance, we learn that at one time the Balto-Slavic, Aryan, Armenian, Thracian, Phrygian and Albanian peoples must have stood in particularly close relations with one another as compared with the remaining Indo-European peoples. This is proved by the fact that all of these languages have in common

¹ Die Sprachverwandtschaftsverhältnisse der Indogermanischen Sprachen (Weimar, 1872.)

² Kretschmer, Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, chap. IV.

³ Sprachwissenschaft und Geschichte, p. 492 f.

changed an original palatal mute into a spirant, whereas the other languages present either the mute or a continuation of it. To take but a single illustration, Indo-European *kmtom* gives on the one hand, Sanskrit, *çatam*; Avestan, *satəm*; Lithuanian, *szimtas*; on the other, *ἐ-κατόν*, *centum*; Old Irish, *cet*; Gothic, *hund*. Along with this goes a parallel treatment of the gutturals, so that all chance of accidental coincidence is excluded. That this dialectic variation should, as Hirt believes, have been accompanied by geographical separation does not seem to me improbable. This is also the opinion of Von Bradke.¹ Before it took place, however, there must have been especial ties connecting Germans, Lithuanians and Slavs, as is shown by certain coincidences of vocabulary, and by the extension of the *m*-suffix for the instrumental plural instead of the *bh*-suffix of the other languages.² These are facts of historical value, as is also the fact that at a later period the Lithuanian and Slavic peoples were brought again into contact with the "centum" peoples, most probably with the Germans, for Lithuanian *smakrà*, Lettic *smakrs* "chin"³ shows the guttural unchanged (contrast Sanskrit *çmaçru*, "beard") and must have been borrowed from a "centum" language after this phonetic law had ceased to act.⁴

Geographically and historically Persia and India are far apart, but no languages stand in closer relations than the languages of the Veda and Avesta. Whole stanzas of the Avesta can by the application of phonetic laws be turned into perfectly good Vedic poetry. A specimen of this may be seen in Jackson's Avesta Grammar, p. xxxi. No sentence of Greek, for instance, could be changed into any other Indo-European language by the same process; nor does such close correlation exist elsewhere in the Indo-European family except perhaps between the Lithuanian and the Lettic.⁵ This similarity of the languages proves that they must have gone through a common period of development, or in terms of history that there was a time when the Indian and Iranian peoples lived together speaking a language that was essentially a unit.

¹ Beiträge zur Erkenntniss der vorhistorischen Entwicklung unseres Sprachstammes.

² Cf. Kretschmer, p. 109 sq.

³ Cf. Old Irish, *Smech*.

⁴ Cf. for other examples Kretschmer, 108 sq.

⁵ Cf. Bloomingfield, *American Journal of Philology*, V. 181.

Kretschmer, (p. 126, ff.,) calls attention to points of similarity that connect the Aryan languages with the Italic and the Keltic, e. g., Sanskrit *-rāj* = Latin *rēg* = Old Irish *rì*, (gen. *ríg*) a word which together with its kindred is confined to these three branches, for the apparently related Germanic words, e. g., Gothic *reiks*, are borrowed from the Celtic; also Sanskrit *brahma* = Latin *flamen*; Sanskrit *aryaka* = Old Irish *airech*; Sanskrit *ṣṛād dadhāmi* = Latin *crēdo* = Old Irish *cretim*. The solution that he offers for this is that a tribe must have wandered from the west to the east, and then been vanquished and absorbed, leaving in these words a trace of its language. If this hypothesis shall prove to be accepted in spite of the venturesomeness, which its author insists is only apparent, we shall have proof of a migration that may well be compared as Kretschmer does with that of the Vandal from the banks of the Oder to the south of Spain, although one has and the other lacks tradition in history.

Apropos of this, it may be remarked, however, that conquest as well as defeat may be fatal to the language of a nation. Prof. Hempl, of the University of Michigan, in an interesting article entitled "Language-Rivalry and Speech-Differentiation in the Case of Race-Mixture"¹ has undertaken to show what the different linguistic results will be in each typical case of race-mixture, thus formulating with more clearness than before the general principles which are to guide in translating linguistic phenomena of this kind into terms of history.

The first case he takes as typical is when a small body of invaders conquers a people and assumes control of the government. It is to their interest to assimilate as quickly as possible with their subjects. Their language perishes, but leaves its mark in the words for the different offices and pursuits that the conquerors had appropriated to themselves, e. g., words for *king*, *priest*, *war*, etc. A good historical example is that of the Norman French in England; others cited by Hempl are those of the Goths in Italy and Spain, the Franks in Gaul, the Normans in France and Italy. According to this, the evidence collected by Kretschmer would point rather to the triumph than to the defeat of the Western people. The presence of a similar stock of Keltic words in Germanic² is ex-

¹ Proceedings American Philological Association, XXIX, 31, ff.

² Cf. Kluge Gr. Germ. Ph. I² 325.

plained by Hempl, in the same way, while similar evidence for Germanic conquest is found in the languages of the Finns and Slavs.

Until the publication of Hübschmann's article "Über die Stellung der Armenischen im Kreise der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen,"¹ Armenian was generally considered an Iranian language. Hübschmann's work proved that its apparent connection with Iranian was due to the large number of words that Armenian had borrowed from Iranian at a very early period, but that it was originally distinct from the Iranian and more closely connected with the languages of Europe. Later investigations² have shown its connection with the Thracian-Phrygian group, confirming the testimony of the ancients.³

Lack of time forbids my going into details, and I will only cite Kretschmer's seventh chapter, on the Thracian-Phrygian people, as a splendid illustration of the way in which linguistic and archaeological investigations may be brought to bear on the solution of such a difficult historical problem as the early migrations from Europe into Asia Minor.

Later chapters of the same book (X-XI) furnish us another example upon which I will dwell with somewhat more detail, because it shows us first, another method in which the study of language is of aid to history, and secondly, because it opens up for us a different chapter of history. Hitherto I have spoken of the prehistoric contact of peoples the evidence for which has been preserved in the points of similarity of their languages. The example I am about to cite will show how geographical names may bear witness for the former extension of a people over a territory from which they have afterwards disappeared. At the same time it will show how language can tell us something of the peoples who once occupied the lands that afterwards became the possession of the Indo-Europeans. These peoples were once wont to be ignored when it was the fashion to think of Europe as uninhabited before the arrival of the Indo-Europeans brought, like the sun, the light

¹ Kuhn's Zeitschrift, XXIII, 1 sq.

² Cf. Kretschmer, 208, ff.

³ Cf. Her. VII., 73: ἔόντες Φρυγῶν ἄποικοι. Eudoxus ap. Steph. of Byzantium, sub voce Ἀρμενία: Ἀρμένιοι τὸ μὲν γένος ἐκ Φρυγίας καὶ τῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσι.

of civilization from the east. Nevertheless they must have exercised a decided influence upon the civilization and language of their conquerors.¹

Kretschmer begins with the consideration of the names of places in Asia Minor which contain a suffix—*-νδ-*—*Ἀλινδα*, *Πίγινδα*, *Κάλυνδα*, etc. These he identifies with the formation that shows in Greece—*-νθ-*—*Τίρυνς*, *Τίρυνθος*, *Κόρινθος*, *Σάμινθος*. If these words are not of Greek origin it may very well be that here, as elsewhere in foreign names, the Greeks have employed *θ* to designate an unaspirated surd mute that did not exactly correspond to the sound they wrote with *τ*. If the names with *-νδ-* in Asia Minor are to be connected with these we have the phonetic change of *-nt-* < *-nd-*. That this change actually occurs in Cilicia is proved by a comparison of simple names like *Τερβέμασις*, *Τέρβημις*, *Τρέβημις* with the compounds *Ρωνδέρβεμις*: *Τβερασήτας*, *Τβερήμωσις* but *Ρωνδβέρρας* *Ταρκυνδβέρρας*. So for labials in Lycia *Πίγραμις*, but *Ρωμβίγρεμις* *Τροκομβίγρεμις*. Curiously enough in Lycian inscriptions we find characters transliterated by *ñt* that are reflected in Greek alphabets by *-νδ-* which Kretschmer ingeniously explains by supposing that the Lycian writing is historical (for which he cites an interesting parallel), while the Greek is phonetic. That this agreement between Cilicia and Lycia is not a mere coincidence is shown by the fact that the intermediate Greek dialect of Pamphylia alone, of all the Greek dialects shows this change *πένδε* = *πέντε*. Hence it is most natural to assume that this change in the Pamphylian dialect is due to such a change in the native dialect of the aborigines, i. e., Pisidians or Cilicians, with whom the Greek colonists mingled. Thus we obtain evidence for this change throughout the whole of Southern Asia Minor. Consequently we must suppose that in the names for places ending in *-νδα* *-νδος* we have evidence of the extent of peoples speaking related languages over Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Lycia, Pisidia, Cilicia, Lycaonia, Cappadocia, while in the midst of them we find that the Phrygians and Bithynians have inserted themselves like a wedge. An examination of the names for persons found among these nations strengthens the proof that they are all speakers of related

¹Cf. Hirt. *Indo-Germanische Forschungen* IV, 31 ff.; *Hempl. op. cit.* XXI X 39 ff.

languages or dialects; and as we possess sufficient knowledge of the Lycian to show that it belongs neither to the Indo-European nor to the Semitic family, we reach the conclusion that these peoples constitute a separate family of languages. Proper names like *Τίρυνθ*-, *Κόρινθος*, already mentioned show that this family must have once extended over the islands of the Ægean and part of the Balkan peninsula, and Kretschmer finds further proof for it in names for places formed with sigmatic suffixes in Greek, e. g., *Πάρισσος*.

More than this Kretschmer does not consider proven, though he is not inclined to reject offhand Pauli's attempt to prove the extension of this people as far north as the Danube, and their identification with that mysterious people, the Etruscans in Italy.

The importance of these ethnological questions for history is indisputable; in them language is the surest leader, and the limits of its power of proof generally coincide with the limits of our knowledge.

So far I have not spoken of what would a few years ago have been brought to the front as the great historical achievement of the study of language, the reconstruction of the civilization of the Indo-European people—the process which was inaugurated by Kuhn and Pictet and styled *Linguistic Palaeontology*. The method of this so-called science was to determine the vocabulary of the Indo-Europeans, and ascribe to their civilization the ideas and material objects for which they were found to have names and in this way determine the progress they had made, physically, mentally and morally, in civilization. Apparently the method is simplicity itself, but practically the difficulties in the way of a complete attainment of this object have so far, with a better understanding of the nature of language, been found insurmountable.

A consideration of the nature of these difficulties that are to be met may, as showing some of the directions that the future study of language may profitably take, form the close of this paper. In the first place a sketch of the civilization of a people upon such a basis can never be complete, we may in some cases prove that the word and consequently the thing that it designated existed at such and such a period. But our inability to

prove the existence of a word can never be taken as proof that the object designated by it did not exist, or was not known at the time in question. In other words the *argumentum ex silentio* is inadmissible. In this direction as regards the material civilization help is to be looked for from the further progress of prehistoric archaeology, while a comparison of other peoples still living in what we may consider a similar stage of progress may throw light upon the other sides of the Indo-European civilization. So that the difficulty may become smaller and smaller, even though it may never be entirely eliminated.

More difficult still is the problem of determining what constituted the vocabulary of the "undivided Indo-Europeans." Words that are found in all Indo-European languages are rare indeed, and even these are open to double interpretation. They may be a common inheritance from the earliest period, of essential unity, or they may have arisen after the "first division" at some point in the Indo-European territory, and passed by a series of borrowing from one tribe to another. Much more frequently, however, we find a word represented in some members of the family only and the question then arises, did it previously exist in all and was it lost by some, or did its possession constitute a dialectic peculiarity characteristic of those members of the family, that have preserved it? To this must be added the difficulty caused by the lack of chronology for the reconstructed forms, which exposes us to the danger of ascribing to the same period forms and words that may in reality be as far, if not farther, apart than those of Chaucer and of modern times. Furthermore, as the meanings of words change, it is not always possible to determine exactly what meaning was assigned to the reconstructed form. Thus, on the basis of *πόλις*, Sanskrit *puris*, Lithuanian *pilis*, we reconstruct *pllis*, but we may not ascribe to it either the meaning of *πόλις* or of our "city."

The solution of these difficulties, so far as they may ever prove capable of solution, is to be approached by a more thorough and systematic study of etymology. Etymology for its own sake was more in vogue during the early period of the scientific study of language. In recent years the necessity of

determining exactly the laws that determine the changes of form which words have undergone has brought to the front the study of morphology and phonology. Etymology has, as Hirt says, been "selectively" pursued, and the principle of selection has been to choose those etymologies especially which will illustrate phonetic laws. Anyone who wishes to convince himself of this can do so by noticing how many words that are met with frequently in reading are absent from the indices of our grammars. This defect in grammatical work has been unavoidable, but it is pleasing to note that the pendulum is beginning to swing in the other direction, and there is a tendency to go systematically to work on the etymology of the different languages. This must lead to a more systematic study of the principles that govern the changes of meaning, which may help us to ascertain the causes that lead to the loss of linguistic material. After a thorough revision of our etymology we may also be in a better position to determine the relative chronology of the reconstructed forms, from a further insight either into phonetic laws, or into the problems of morphology. Of one thing we may feel assured, that no detail, if it brings some new element of truth to our knowledge, will be too insignificant to contribute in some way towards throwing light upon the way in which human civilization has developed.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

THE CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS.¹

Of the four Evangelists, Saint Luke alone gives any important chronological details in connection with the birth of Jesus Christ. Saint Mark and Saint John begin their narratives with the preaching of the Baptist and the Baptism of our Lord. Saint Matthew speaks of His miraculous conception and of His birth from a Virgin Mother; as to the time and place of the latter event, he merely relates that it took place in Bethlehem of Judea during the reign of King Herod.² Saint Luke, on the other hand, describes it in connection with a political event, a general census of the Roman Empire, taken by command of Cæsar Augustus.³ He relates that Mary and Joseph came to Bethlehem to be enrolled in the city of their origin, for they were "of the house and family of David."⁴ While they were in this city, Jesus was born.

The passage which refers to the census is as follows: "Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθην δῆγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. αὕτη (ἡ) ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο, ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κύρινου."⁵ It is generally translated: "In those days there went forth from Cæsar Augustus a decree that the whole world should be enrolled. This first census took place while Quirinius was administering the province Syria."

The importance of the passage lies in this, that the synchronism here made by the Evangelist ought to be of material aid in determining the date of the birth of Christ. Unfortunately, contemporary historians seem to be silent about the census, and in consequence, the accuracy of Saint Luke's account has been questioned by many scholars. They contend that the Evangelist had in mind a census taken in Judea by the same Quirinius ten or twelve years later. As Saint Luke mentions this later enrollment in another passage,⁶ they allege

¹ The following pages are the summary of a dissertation for the degree of Licentiate, presented June 1898, to the Faculty of Theology.

² Matt., I.

³ Ibid., II, 2.

⁴ Luke, I., 1-5.

⁵ Acts., V, 37.

⁶ Ibid., I, 4.

that by some confusion of ideas he antedated the census by connecting it with the birth of Christ, and thus was guilty of a grave chronological error.

As it is likewise to Saint Luke we owe our knowledge of the earliest labors of the Apostles for the spread of Christianity, the determination of his historical reliability becomes still more important. If it can be shown that he erred in the matter of the census, full confidence can be placed neither in his Gospel history nor in the Acts of the Apostles. It must have been, in his time, comparatively easy to discover the truth in regard to such a matter as a census of the people; if, therefore, Saint Luke has erred so glaringly in this case, he deserves to rank, not as a painstaking collector of facts, but as a careless and uncritical compiler of second-hand information.

Saint Luke has always been considered a careful historian. In many places he displays an accurate knowledge of the civil and political affairs of the Empire. Thus he says that the preaching of the Baptist began in "the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, while Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea and Herod tetrach of Galilee, Philip tetrach of Ituraea and Trachonitis and Lysanias tetrach of Abilene."¹ Another example of his accuracy occurs where he speaks of Sergius Paulus, governor of Cyprus as "ἀνθύπατω Σεργίῳ Παυλίῳ" (*Proconsule Sergio Paulo*²). It is true that Cyprus was at that time a *propraetorian* province,³ yet Dio Cassius informs us that all provincial rulers were, by command of Augustus, called "Proconsules."⁴ A writer who is so accurate in small details, is not likely to commit a grave error about a point that must have been of public knowledge during his time. The dating of this census would be for him the matter of a very simple investigation, and we must suppose that he wrote with care for the truth of what he recorded. Otherwise it must be admitted that he invented many other details with which he has surrounded the birth of Christ. For he says that, on account of the census, Mary and Joseph came to Bethlehem; that because of the crowds gathered in

¹ Luke III, 1, 2.

² Acts XIII, 7.

³ Dio Cassius, LIV, 4.

⁴ *Ibid*, LIII, 13, cf. Meyer, commentary, in loco.

the city for the same enrollment they were unable to find shelter in the public inns; that they were forced in consequence to take refuge in a cave, in which rude mansion Jesus was brought into the world.¹ Had Saint Luke invented these details merely for the purpose of impressing his readers, it would have been easy, at that time, to ascertain the truth about them and to correct the error.

From these considerations it is *antecedently* improbable that Saint Luke was mistaken in regard to this census. As he is known to be reliable in other cases, what he records may be held as certain until the contrary can be shown. The burden of proof lies with those who doubt his accuracy; they should produce some known fact or unimpeachable testimony contradicting his statement. If these are not forthcoming, his testimony should be accepted.

The reasons for which the truth of the passage has been questioned are as follows:

1. The silence of the contemporary profane historians proves that the Emperor Augustus issued no edict commanding a general census of the Empire.

2. Even had such an edict been issued, the country of Judea, as it was a kingdom allied to the Roman Empire, would not have been included in the census.

3. The census could not have been taken while Quirinius was governor of Syria, for Saint Luke places it in the last years of Herod's reign, at which time, not Quirinius, but Quintilius Varus was governor of Syria.

These arguments, which we shall examine in detail, are supported by Schürer,² Hock,³ Mommsen,⁴ Hase,⁵ Winer,⁶ Bleek,⁷ Meyer,⁸ Strauss,⁹ Keim,¹⁰ Reuss,¹¹ and others, while the principal upholders of Saint Luke's veracity are Huschke,¹²

¹ Luke, II, 1-7.

² The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ, Vol. II., Div. I, § 17, pp. 143, seqq.

³ Römische Geschichte, I., 2, p. 212.

⁴ Res Gestae Divi Augusti, p. 125.

⁵ Leben Jesu, § 23.

⁶ Real-Wörterbuch, article "Quirinius."

⁷ Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien (1862) I, 66-75.

⁸ Commentary, Luke II, 1-2.

⁹ Leben Jesu (1864), pp. 336-340.

¹⁰ Jesus of Nazara, II, 116-123.

¹¹ Histoire Evangélique, p. 143.

¹² Über den zur Zeit der Geburt Jesu Christi gehalten Census (1840).

Wieseler,¹ Zumpt,² Lutteroth,³ Aberle,⁴ Wallon,⁵ Ewald,⁶ Caspari,⁷ Schaff and Lange,⁸ Lardner,⁹ Ebrard,¹⁰ Gloag,¹¹ Desjardins,¹² Marucchi,¹³ and the Catholic Scripture commentators, such as Ubaldi,¹⁴ Vigouroux,¹⁵ Patrizi,¹⁶ Cornely.¹⁷

I.

The arguments proving that the Emperor Augustus never commanded a general census are laid down by Dr. Schürer,¹⁸ substantially as follows:

1. The Roman historians, Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio Cassius, who would have referred to this edict, make no mention of it.

2. The "Breviarium Imperii" of Augustus,¹⁹ containing an account of the resources of the whole empire, in no way implies a general census.

3. An examination of a supposed reference to a general census in the pages of Dio Cassius,²⁰ shows that the historian merely related that Augustus, as a private man, had taken an account of his personal property.

4. In the Testament of Augustus, preserved on the "Monumentum Ancyranum," mention is made of three enrollments, but each of these was merely a census of Roman citizens.²¹

5. Leaving aside entirely the testimony of the early Fathers,

¹ Chronological Synopsis of the four Gospels (Cambridge, 1864) pp. 95-135.

² Das Geburtsjahr Christi, 1869, pp. 20-264.

³ Le recensement de Quirinius en Judée, Paris, 1865.

⁴ Über den Statthalter Quirinius (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1865, pp. 103-148). 1868, p. 29; 1874, p. 663).

⁵ De la croyance due à l'Evangile, 2e edit., pp. 330, sqq.

⁶ History of Israel, VI, pp. 155-157.

⁷ Chronological and geographical introduction to the Life of Christ, pp. 34-38.

⁸ Commentary, Luke II, 1-2.

⁹ Credibility of the Gospel History, Bk. II, ch. 2 (Works, 1838, vol. I, p. 261 sqq.).

¹⁰ Gospel History.

¹¹ Introd. to Synoptic Gospels (Edinburg, 1895), St. Luke.

¹² Le recensement de Quirinius, in *Revue des questions historiques*, 1867, vol. II, p. 5, sqq.

¹³ Il Censo di San Luca e l'iscrizione di Quirinio, in *Bessarione*, n. 9 (1897).

¹⁴ Introductio ad Sacram Scripturam, vol. I, Thesis XVI, p. 311 sqq.

¹⁵ Le Nouveau Testament et les découvertes archéologiques modernes (1890) I, II, ch. 2.

¹⁶ De Evangelis, I, 2, diss. 18.

¹⁷ Introductio ad Scripturam Sacram, vol. III.

¹⁸ Op. cit., p. 114.

¹⁹ Tacitus, Annales, I, 4; Suetonius, Octavius, 101; Dio Cassius, LIII, 30.

²⁰ Dio Cassius, LIV, 35.

²¹ cf. Mommsen, *Res gestae Divi Augusti*, p. 125.

who cannot be considered impartial witnesses, there remain still the reference in the works of Cassiodorus,¹ Orosius², Isidore of Seville³ and Suidas.⁴ These writers lived in the fifth, seventh and tenth centuries after Christ, and are too far removed from the first century to be considered independent witnesses. The fact that Cassiodorus used older documents, the writings of the "Agrimensores" is no guarantee that Saint Luke was not his original authority on the matter of the census. Suidas gives some details about the manner in which the Emperor's order was carried out, but the fact that he uses the identical words of Saint Luke (*αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο*) plainly shows his dependence upon the Gospel.

6. The so-called "Imperial survey" of Augustus is supposed to confirm the fact of a general census. Agrippa, indeed, collected materials for a map of the world⁵, but it is doubtful whether this work rests upon a general survey of the empire, ordered by Augustus. That such a survey was begun by Julius Cæsar and completed under Augustus is affirmed by the cosmographers, Julius Honorius and Ethicus Ister, but this would have had to do with merely geographical investigations.

The first apparent contradiction of the Gospel narrative lies in the silence of the Roman historians, Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio Cassius. They would naturally be expected to mention such an important event as a general census, but the only enrollments recorded by them are lists of Roman citizens.

The nature and present condition of the works of these writers weaken this argument. The Annals of Tacitus begin with the reign of Tiberius, the successor of Augustus. He is not, therefore, expected to have recorded every event of the time of the latter.

The work of Dio Cassius is, unfortunately, not complete enough to show whether or not he has mentioned the census. The fifty-fifth book, comprising the years A. U. C. 745 to 761 exists only in fragments. As Suetonius is not properly a his-

¹ Variorum, III, 52.

² Histor. VI, 22, 6.

³ Etymologiarum, V, 36, 4.

⁴ Lexicon, *Απογραφῆς, Αυγούστου*.

⁵ Pliny, Hist. Nat., III, 2, 17

torian but rather a compiler of biographies, it is not suprising that he may have omitted all reference to the census.¹

The negative argument from the silence of contemporaries avails only when a certain writer could not fail to have known an alleged fact, and having known it could not fail to have mentioned it in a certain work in which it is ignored. But when neither the scope nor the purpose of the work require a reference to it, then its absence is no argument against its probability.² Neither the scope nor the purpose of Tacitus or Suetonius required them to notice the census, and the condition of the fifty-fifth book of Dio Cassius hinders us from knowing whether he has mentioned it or not.

Besides, the mention of the "Breviarium Imperii" by each of these writers³ is an indirect confirmation of St. Luke's statement. This "libellus" described *all* the resources of the empire, not only of Rome and its provinces, but also of the allied kingdoms (*regna*); it enumerated all the soldiers, not only the citizens, but also the allies (*quantum civium sociorumque in armis*); it contained an account of the tribute and customs (*tributa aut vectigalia*), and was written entirely by the hand of the emperor. Such an exact description of the imperial resources could not easily have been made without a census and one that included also the allied kingdoms. Augustus was the great organizer of the Roman government and under him especially the system of taxation and tribute-levying upon the dependencies of the empire was perfected. It is evident that a general census is an essential preliminary to a perfect system of taxation.

Schürer's interpretation of the reference in Dio Cassius to a census of "παντα τα υπάρχοντα οί," taken by Augustus, is not accepted by all scholars. Aberle⁴ and Marquardt⁵ are of

¹ Of the eighty books of Dio Cassius relating the Roman History from the foundation of the City to 229 A. D., only books 37-54 remain complete. They cover the period from 689 to 744 B. C. The later books are known to us only through excerpts and summaries.

² See De Smedt, *Principes de la Critique Historique*, pp. 226-238.

³ Tacitus, *Annales* I, 11, "Opes publicae continebantur, quantum civium sociorumque in armis, quot classes, regna . . . tributa aut vectigalia . . . quaecumque sua manu praescripserat Augustus . . .;" Suetonius, *Octavius*, 101, Dio Cassius, LVI, 33.

⁴ *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1874, p. 665 sqq.

⁵ *Handbuch der Römisch. Alterthümer*, p. 169.

opinion that instead of being translated "all his personal property," it should read, "all that is subject to him" (*in a special manner*), hence, at least, the provinces under control of legates appointed directly by him.

The next point is, that the writers who confirm Saint Luke's statement are unworthy of credence. Leaving aside the early Fathers, there are Orosius, Isidore of Seville, Cassiodorus and Suidas.¹ It is claimed that they drew their inspiration from Saint Luke.

The testimonies of Cassiodorus and Suidas are worthy of our consideration. The former, who lived 480-575 A. D., states that at the time of Augustus the Roman world was divided into parts and described by a census.² The passage shows no signs of having been copied from Saint Luke; the mere fact of the writer's Christianity is not sufficient to discredit it. It is admitted that he employed much earlier sources, the writings of the "Agrimensores," and from a reference in the same epistle to a certain "Gromaticus," it is probable that Hyginus, surnamed "Gromaticus," a writer on land surveying, of the time of Trajan (97-117 A. D.), was one of his authorities. It is unjust and uncritical, therefore, to reject his testimony upon a mere suspicion that he may have relied on the Gospel.

Suidas, the lexicographer, who wrote about the tenth century, has noted some details in regard to the census. Under the word "Απογραφή" he says that Augustus, on becoming sole master of the imperial power, chose twenty men of proved integrity and sent them throughout the empire to take a census of persons and goods. Under the word "Αυγουστος Καίσαρ" he says also that Augustus ordered a numbering of all the inhabitants of the empire, as he wished to know the number of his subjects.

In spite of these details, given by no other writer, because he makes use of the words of Saint Luke ("αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο") he is said to have merely copied from the Evangelist. The coincidence shows indeed that he was acquainted with the Gospel and probably took these words from it, but he must have drawn the accompanying details from other sources.

¹ Loc. cit.

² Variorum, lib. IV, ep. 52, apud Migne, PL., LXIX, 608.

Though his work dates only from the tenth century, it must be remembered that he had access to numbers of ancient monuments that have since disappeared. He might easily have employed some documents that have perished since his time.

His testimony is indirectly confirmed from other sources. Two bronze tablets, bearing the fragments of a speech delivered by the Emperor Claudius before the Roman Senate in the year A. U. C. 801 (A. D. 47), were discovered in 1547 on the hill of San Sebastian, near Lyons. The fragments contain a reference to a census taken in Gaul by Drusus, father of this emperor.¹ Now, Tacitus mentions a census taken in Gaul by Germanicus, brother of Claudius, in the year A. U. C. 767 (A. D. 13).² The one noted in the inscription must have been earlier. Lutteroth assigns it to the year A. U. C. 742 (B. C. 12). The same census is mentioned in the so-called "Epitome" of Titus Livius, erroneously ascribed to that author.³ The work is certainly of the first century, and when the writer says of Gaul "a Druso census actus est," it certainly confirms the fragment.

There is also the "Imperial Survey" of Augustus, said by Dr. Schürer to be very problematical. It is described in the famous "Cosmographia" of Ethicus Ister, a work of the fourth century.⁴ The work was completed in thirty-two years, having been begun under Julius Cæsar and finished by Augustus. Pliny speaks of Augustus and Agrippa in connection with the work and mentions the map supposed to have been based upon its measurements, the celebrated "Orbis pictus" of Agrippa.⁵ Frontinus speaks of a certain Balbus as overseer of the work during the time of Augustus.⁶ The fact that such a work was undertaken lends a weight of inherent probability to Saint Luke's statement about a general census, as a census would follow very naturally upon a topographical survey of the empire. According to existing accounts the survey began in A. U. C. 709 (45 B. C.) and was finished about A. U. C.

¹ H. Lutteroth, *Le recensement de Quirinius en Judée*, Paris, 1865, pp. 90-97.

² *Annales*, I, 31.

³ *Epitome*, I, 36, apud Desjardins, loc. cit.

⁴ D' Avezac, "Mémoire sur Ethicus," in "Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles lettres," t. II, 1852, pp. 230-431.

⁵ *Hist. Nat.*, III, 3.14, and VI, 31.14.

⁶ Frontinus, *De Coloniais libellus apud Goesius, Rei agrariae auctores*, 1674.

741 (12 or 13 B. C.). This latter date is sufficiently close to that of the birth of our Lord to warrant the supposition that the census might have followed upon the survey.

Tertullian says that the records of the census were preserved in the archives of Rome.¹ Professor Ramsay rightly remarks that Tertullian did not merely copy Saint Luke, for he asserts that the census was held under Sentius Saturninus.² Most probably he was acquainted with a document which spoke of a census held 9-8 B. C., at which time Saturninus was governor of Syria.

In the article quoted already, Professor Ramsay adduces further evidence of the existence of a general census plan. The discovery was made a few years ago that periodical enrollments were made in Egypt under the Roman empire. It was proved with certainty that they took place in the years (A. D.) 89-90, 103-104, 117-118 and so on, to the year 229-230, that is, at intervals of fourteen years.

It is probable that any important political device, existing as early as the time of Vespasian, originated under Augustus. In fact, if we divide the years, from the beginning of Augustus' reign to 89-90, into periods of fourteen years, most of the census enumerations known from history will fall in one or other of the census periods thus formed. Thus in the year 9-8 B. C., fourteen years after Augustus assumed the "Tribunicia potestas" a census was taken of the Roman citizens, as attested by the "Monumentum Ancyranum."

In the year 5-6 A. D., which would be the date of the second census period, what is known as the second census of Quirinius in Judea was held.³ That this census extended also to Syria is shown by an inscription, long considered a forgery, but proved to be genuine by the discovery of the original stone at Venice, in 1880.⁴ The inscription records that by order of Quirinius, governor of Syria, Q. Aemilius Secundus made a census of the city of Apamea, and numbered in it 170,000 inhabitants.

¹ Adv. Marcion, IV, Migne, PL. II, 370.

² Adv. Judaeos, 9, Migne, PL. II, 9; Ramsay, article in *Expositor*, May, 1897.

³ Acts, V, 37; Josephus, Antiquities, XVII, 13, 5; XVIII, 1, 1.

⁴ Ramsay, in op. cit. pp. 346-7; Vigouroux, op. cit. p. 108-9, where the inscription may be seen.

In A. D. 36, in the fourth census-period, the Clitae in Cilicia rose in revolt because they were compelled "nostrum in modum deferre census."¹

In the year 47-48, A. D. the Emperor Claudius numbered the Roman citizens;² by calculation it is found that in A. D. 47-48 fell the fifth census period.

From these facts, taken together, though each is slight in itself, comes a probability that the Egyptian census-periods are not peculiar to Egypt but frequently coincide with the taking of the census in some other part of the Empire, and that the Egyptian custom springs out of some principle of wider application. In several cases the Roman historians record only the census of Roman citizens, and with true Roman pride regard the census of the subject-population as beneath the dignity of historical record. Augustus, too, was silent about this fact in the "Monumentum Ancyranum." But we find also that in this document he makes no mention of his reorganization of the provinces.³

After considering all the above references, it can be safely said that there is no evidence of Saint Luke's inaccuracy, on this point at least. True, we have noted the absence of direct confirmation in contemporary profane writings, but that has not been inexplicable. Indirect confirmation of the Evangelist from both profane and sacred sources, contemporary and sub-contemporary, has been found in abundance. Passing references in the pages of historians, parallel passages on the monuments and records of different parts of the Roman Empire seem to indicate the existence of a scheme of periodical enrollment; in such a scheme could the census mentioned by Saint Luke have been included.

II.

1. It is objected that, because Judea was, in the time of Herod, not a Roman province but a kingdom allied to the empire, it could not have been included in a general census, had such been commanded. An allied kingdom, though under

¹ Tacitus, *Annales*, VI, 41.

² *Ibid.*, XI. 25; Suetonius, *Claudius*, 16.

³ Ramsay, *loc. cit.*, p. 847.

the suzerainty of the Roman Empire, possessed its own ruler and was governed, to a great extent, by its own laws. Herod was therefore an almost independent sovereign, and, besides, was treated as a friend by the Emperor; it cannot be supposed, then, that a Roman valuation census would be made in his country.

2. Tacitus mentions a census taken in the allied kingdom of Cilicia Tracheia, under Archelaus,¹ but the passage implies that he did this "after the Roman plan."

3. References in Josephus and other writers, to Herod's dependence upon the imperial power, merely prove that this king was in some way subject to the emperor. They furnish absolutely no proof of the possibility of a Roman census of Judea. Furthermore such an event as the first introduction into the country of a Roman census would surely have been noticed by the Jewish historian, yet he makes no mention of it.

For the above reasons,¹ Saint Luke is said to have erred by applying to Judea a principle that could never have been applied to that country—the principle of census-taking under an edict from the central government.

With regard to the allied kingdoms, it has been well remarked that some authors write of them at the present day as though they had been absolutely independent states. Then numerous quotations prove that they possessed the mere shadow of independence, those who in this case doubt Saint Luke's accuracy admit that they prove everything except the possibility of these kingdoms being subjected to an imperial census. They grant to Cæsar the power to commend any act, to insist upon any change in the policy of the government, even to remit the taxes of the people, yet they deny him the power to command the same king to number his people.

That the independence of an allied kingdom was of a merely nominal character may easily be shown from the histories of the times. From Strabo we learn that they were instituted as a preparatory step to the incorporation of a country into a Roman province.² Regions not yet ripe for administration as provinces were first made into dependent kingdoms, but the

¹ *Annales*, VI, 41.

² Cf. Schürer, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-132.

³ Strabo, *Bk. XIV*, apud Ramsay, *loc. cit.*

king was merely an instrument in the hands of the emperor. Two examples showing this are found in the pages of Tacitus. King Archelaus was enticed from Cappadocia to Rome, and upon accusations which every one knew to be false was deposed by the emperor.¹ Rhescuporis, king of Thrace, was, for his crimes, banished from the kingdom by order of Cæsar.

Suetonius, speaking of the manner in which the "Reges socii" were treated by Augustus, says: "Reges socios, etiam inter semetipsos, necessitudinibus mutuis junxit . . . nec aliter universos quam membra, partesque Imperii curae habuit."² Tacitus has preserved an example of a census taken in an allied kingdom, that of Cilicia Tracheia, governed by King Archelaus.³ To overcome the opposition of the tribe of the Clitæ to this measure, it was necessary to call in the aid of a Roman army. The census was always the first step to the Romanizing of a country. We cannot conceive that Archelaus would, as some have held, begin, of his own accord, the Romanization of his kingdom. Turning now to the kingdom of Judea, we shall see whether or not Herod was a semi-independent sovereign. It is claimed that the many passages cited from Josephus to show his subordinate position prove nothing except that he was not entirely independent of Rome. An examination of these passages, arranged in chronological order, will enable us to determine this for ourselves.

In the first place he was sent to Judea by "Caesar, Antony and the Senate."⁴ When he had taken the city of Jerusalem, he besought the Roman generals to restrain the soldiers from plunder, as he did not wish the Romans to make him king of a desert.⁵ It is useful to insert here the statement of Appian that Herod, king of the Idumeans, was among those who had to pay tribute,⁶ and this in spite of the fact that Herod and Antony were always friends.⁷ Note, too, that when Pompey took the city of Jerusalem, he made it tribu-

¹ *Annales*, II, 42.

² *Ibid.*, II, 67.

³ *Octavius*, 48.

⁴ *Annales*, VI, 41.

⁵ *Josephus*, *Wars*, I, 14-15.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁷ *Appian*, *de Bello Civ*, IV (apud Lardner, *op. cit.*).

⁸ *Josephus*, *Wars*, I, 14.

tary to Rome.¹ Further, a certain Fabatus is spoken of as the steward of Cæsar in Judea, while Herod was ruling.² Herod, too, as being in especially high favor with Augustus, was enrolled among the Procurators of Syria.³

Then Herod's sons were accused of rebellion against him, he could not punish them without the permission of Caesar,⁴ and when he himself, without this permission, made war upon Obodas, King of Arabia, the emperor wrote to him angrily, saying that while in the past he had treated him as a friend he should now use him as a subject.⁵

In the latter part of Herod's reign, the Jewish people were obliged to swear fealty to Caesar and to the king's government. The Pharisees, to the number of six thousand, refused to do this and were punished by a fine.⁶

After Herod's death, Archelaus, by the will of Caesar, succeeded his father in Judea.⁷ Shortly after his accession the Jews petitioned the emperor to be placed under the government of the "Praeses" of Syria. They alleged the harsh treatment that they had received from Herod and their fear of receiving the same from his son.⁸ Finally, in the tenth year of the reign of Archelaus, Augustus deposed him, incorporated his kingdom into the province of Syria and banished him to Vienne.⁹

To an unbiassed reader and comparer of the quoted passages, Herod's fancied and much-insisted upon independence appears but poorly supported. The most evident conclusion is that in Judea the emperor had complete authority, while Herod was merely his subordinate officer. If the emperor could dispose of the king at his will, there was nothing to prevent him ordering that the subjects of the same king should be numbered and their property valued.

Nor need we seek far for a motive for such a proceeding. The census was but a preliminary step to the formation of a

¹ *Ib.*, *Antiq.* XIV, 4.

² *Ib.*, *Wars*, I, 29.

³ *Ib.*, *Antiq.*, I, 10.

⁴ *Antiq.* XVI, 11.

⁵ *Ib.*, XVI, 9, 8.

⁶ *Ib.*, XVII, 2.

⁷ *Ib.*, *Wars*, II, 2.

⁸ *Antiq.*, XVII, 11.

⁹ *Ib.*, XVII, 18; XVIII, 1.

province. From the fact that Judea was reduced to the condition of a province but a few years after the death of Herod, we may conclude that the emperor had this in mind long before it was carried out.

The silence of Josephus is another objection to the fact of a census in Judea. In his detailed account of the reign of Herod there is no mention of such measure.

Yet this is by no means extraordinary. For the historian was, in the first place, a Jew and a priest, and, secondly, a pensioner of the Emperor Vespasian. In his history he had to vindicate the Roman officials in Judea, and at the same time to avoid offending his fellow-countrymen. Hence, though he is, as a rule, a reliable, he is by no means an absolutely accurate historian. For example, he tells of the many favors of Julius Caesar, Augustus and others to the Jews, yet omits a certain journey through Judea made by the young Caius Caesar in the beginning of the reign of Archelaus. Suetonius relates it, and with it a circumstance which accounts for its omission by Josephus, his failure to attend the services in the Temple.¹ Again, in his history of the Jewish wars he fails to mention a certain battle which influenced the ruin of the Jewish race. From his lips alone we learn of it.²

Further, in his account of the siege of Jerusalem, he says that the Temple was burned despite the efforts of Titus to save it. Sulpicius Severus in his chronicle says that its destruction was determined upon at a council of Titus and his generals. A study of this chronicle has convinced Bernays that Sulpicius Severus copied entire passages of Tacitus, from works of his now lost. Hence it would appear that the Roman historian contradicted Josephus, who probably wrote his account of it at the command of Titus himself.³

From the above-mentioned fact of a Jewish embassy praying for annexation to the province of Syria, we may judge that a census would have caused no general revolt; hence there is so much the less reason for his mentioning it. For his account of Herod's reign, Josephus drew largely from the work of Nicholas of Damascus, a friend and flatterer of that king, and

¹ Octavius, 93.

² Josephus, *Life*, 6.

³ J. Bernays, *On the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus*.

a writer who, according to Josephus, wrote his history so as please Herod, "touching upon nothing but what tended to his glory, openly excusing many of his notorious crimes and diligently concealing them."¹ Evidently the census was not a source of honor but of mortification to Herod. From the character of Nicholas we may conclude that he did not give a particular account of the affair, nor had Josephus any inducement to supply the defect.

There is, however, a passage in Josephus which seems to refer to a census of some kind. Remarking upon the opposition of the Pharisees to the existing government, he says: "Accordingly, when the whole Jewish nation took an oath to be faithful to Caesar and to the king's government, these men, to the number of six thousand, refused to swear."² Without a census of some kind it would be impossible accurately to estimate the number. And as a census would be accompanied by an oath of allegiance, this passage strengthens the contention that a Roman census in Judea during the lifetime of Herod is within the bounds of probability. The testimonies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian afford further proof of the fact. In his first apology, addressed to the Emperor Antoninus, Justin mentions the census as follows: "Now there is a certain village (Bethlehem) in the land of Judaea, in which Jesus Christ was born, as you can learn from the returns made at the time of Quirinius, who became your first procurator in Judea."³ Tertullian also, in two of his apologetical works, bears witness to the same fact, and appeals to the Roman archives for support.⁴ Neither Justin nor Tertullian would have employed against their enemies this proof of Christ's birth, had they not positive evidence of it. Were it false, the misstatement could easily be discovered and confuted.

From this we may safely conclude that the impossibility of a Roman census in Judea during the reign of Herod cannot be shown. The relations between the empire and the allied kingdoms, particularly in the case of Judea, prove clearly

Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 1; XVI. 7.

Ibid., XVII. 2, 6.

Apol. I. 34, apud Migne, PG. VI. 333.

Adv. Judæos, 9, apud Migne PL. II. 624; and *adv. Marcionem*, IV, 19 PL. II. 406.

enough that a Roman census could and would be held there. And as to Josephus, while it is not certain that he has failed to mention the census, the fact of his omitting it is not proof sufficient that it did not take place.

III.

Granting that a Roman census was taken in Judea during the reign of Herod, was Quirinius then administering the province of Syria?

Both Saint Luke and Saint Matthew place the birth of Christ in the reign of Herod,¹ hence, according to Saint Luke, Quirinius was governor of Syria during the lifetime of Herod.

Now, both Josephus and Tacitus assert that the governor of Syria at the time of Herod's death was P. Quintilius Varus.² Josephus furthermore says that the immediate predecessor of Varus was C. Sentius Saturninus.³ Saturninus, then, was governor of Syria A. U. C. 746-748, and Varus A. U. C. 748-750.⁴ Hence, in the last years of Herod's reign, when Christ was born, Quirinius could not have been governor of Syria, nor could the census have been taken during his term of office.

That this difficulty has always been considered a serious one is evident from the various solutions proposed in order to make Saint Luke's account conform with that of profane writers. Several emendations of the Greek text have been proposed; in reference to these it is sufficient to say that none of them are satisfactory. They are all forced explanations, based upon the supposition that Quirinius had but one term as governor of Syria. That he was governor at the time of the deposition of Archelaus (about A. D. 7) we know from Josephus⁵ and from the inscription of Q. Aemilius Secundus, already quoted. Both Josephus and Tacitus speak of Varus as governor at Herod's death, but from the accession of Archelaus to his banishment, Josephus does not speak of the governor of Syria. This is to be borne in mind in considering the possibility that Quirinius had an earlier term as governor.

¹ Luke, I, 5; Matthew, II, 1.

² Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII, 5, 9; Wars, I, 22, 23; Tacitus, *Histor.* V, 9.

³ *Antiq.* XVII.

⁴ Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Augusti*, l. c.

⁵ *Antiq.* XVIII, 1.

From contemporary historians, and from inscriptions, much can be gleaned of the life of Quirinius. He was born at Lanuvium.¹ Josephus states that he was a Roman senator and had passed through all the other magistracies until he became consul.² In the order of advancement rigorously kept, the Roman officer would be successively, quinquevir, quaestor, tribune, praetor and finally consul.³ The first reference to his public life concerns his praetorship. Florus says that he subdued the tribes of Marmarides and Garamantes, occupying the country to the south of Cyrenaica, alongside of Egypt.⁴ Professor Mommsen shows that only as governor of the province of Crete and Cyrenaica, a praetorian province, could he have done this.⁵

In the year 742 A. U. C. he was consul with M. V. Messala Barbatus Appianus. Tacitus informs us that he subdued the Homonades, a tribe of Cilicia, and for this he received the honors of a triumph.⁶

When Caius Caesar, the adopted son of Augustus, was sent into Armenia, Quirinius accompanied him as tutor.⁷ In 759 A. U. C. he was sent into Syria as governor of that province, and at this time directed the census taken in Judea at the banishment of Archelaus.⁸

Tacitus again shows him at Rome, A. U. C. 769, petitioning the emperor in behalf of his kinsman, Libo Drusus, and⁹ finally tells us that he died there A. U. C. 774.¹⁰

It is to be noted in this sketch that no information is given as to the public offices held by him from the time of his consulate, A. U. C. 742, to that of his campaign against the Homonades, about A. U. C. 750, nor are we told in what official capacity he subdued these tribes. Now, the eastern part of Cilicia, which they occupied, very probably was at that

¹ Tacitus, *Annales* III, 22, 48.

² *Antiq.* XVIII, 1.

³ Cf. E. Desjardins, in *Revue des questions historiques*, t. II, p. 14.

⁴ Florus, *Epitome*, II, 31.

⁵ *Res gestae divi Augustus*, p. 120.

⁶ *Annales*, III, 48, cf. *Strobo*, XII, 6.5.

⁷ Tacitus, *Annales*, III, 22, 48.

⁸ Josephus, *Antiq.*, XVII, 13.

⁹ *Annales*, II, 30.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* III, 48.

time under the jurisdiction of the governor of Syria.¹ In accordance with the Roman method of provincial government, only the governors of proconsular provinces, such as Syria, could command an army, make war or preserve the peace of the province. Hence, unless we suppose for Quirinius an entirely special mission as commander of the army, he may at that time have been governor of Syria.

The famous Tiburtine inscription, discovered in 1764 at Tivoli, the ancient Tibur, has thrown much light on this question. Sanelemente, in 1793, conjectured that it could apply only to Quirinius,² and Prof. Theodor Mommsen, of Berlin, in 1865, arrived at the same conclusion,³ which is now almost universally accepted.⁴

The fragments of the inscription, which can be found in the work of Prof. Mommsen, quoted below, are as follows:

EGEM ' QVA ' REDACTA ' IN ' POT
AVGVSTI ' POPVLIVQE ' ROMANI ' SENAT
SVPLICATIONES ' BINAS ' OB ' RES ' PROSP
IPSI ' ORNAMENTA ' TRIVMPF
PROCONSVL ' ASIAM ' PROVINCIAM ' OP
DIVI ' AVGVSTI ' TERVM ' SVRIAM ' ET ' PH

The fragment does not contain the name of the one in whose honor the inscription was set up, but it furnishes a few indications that may help to discover it.

1. He conquered some nation for Rome, for this was twice voted "Supplicationes" and decreed the honors of a triumph.
2. He was made by Augustus proconsul of Asia.
3. He was twice governor of the province of Syria and Phœnicia.
4. He outlived Augustus, for the title "Divus" was not applied to the Roman emperors during their lifetime.

The inscription, therefore, must apply to one of the governors of Syria, the one to whom these four indications will direct it.

¹ Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*; Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Vol. I., p. 363.

² *De vulgaris aerae emendatione*, p. 414-426.

³ *Res gestae Divi Augusti*, Berlin, 1865, Appendix.

⁴ Cf. Lutheroth, Aberle, Desjardins, Gloag, Ubaldi, *op. cit.*

The list of the Syrian governors, as far as it is now known, is about as follows:¹

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------|
| 1. M. T. Cicero, | A. U. C. 724 or 727 | B. C. 30 or 27 | |
| 2. Varro, | " 729 - 731 | " 29 - 23 | |
| 3. M. Titius, between | " 741 and 745 | " 13 and 10 | |
| 4. Sentius Saturninus | " 746 - 748 | " 8 - 6 | |
| 5. P. Quintilius Varus | " 748 - 750 | " 6 - 4 | |
| 6. ————— | " 750 - 753 | " 4 - 1 | |
| 7. Caius Caesar | " 753 - 757 | " 1 - - | A. D. 4, |
| 8. L. Volusius Saturninus | " 757 - 758 | | " 4-5. |
| 9. P. Sulpicius Quirinius | " 759 - 763 | | " 5-9. |
| 10. C. M. Creticus Silanus | " 763 - 770 | | " 9-16. |

It will be noticed that, according to this list, none of the Syrian governors held more than one term of office, and also that there is a gap in the list, between the years A. U. C. 750 and 753, B. C. 4 to 1. Professor Mommsen concludes that the name to be supplied in this gap is that of one of those already in the list, and to that one the inscription applies.

The learned professor shows that none of the officials included in the list, with the exception of Quirinius fulfills the conditions implied in the inscription. He, on the contrary, answers to them remarkably. We have seen that he subdued the tribe of the Homonades, and for this conquest received at Rome the honors of a triumph. Mommsen also shows that in the natural course of events he must have been proconsul of Asia. He died in the year 774 and hence was still alive at the time of Augustus' death. Hence he concludes that the Tivoli fragment refers to Quirinius, that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria, and that his first term of office extended from A. U. C. 750 to 753 or thereabouts. With this solution he restores the inscription as follows:

P. SVLPICIVS P. F. QVIRINIVS, COS.
 PR. PRO CONSVL CRETAM ET CYRENAS PROVINCIAM OPTINVIT
 LEGATVS PR. PR. DIVI AVGVSTI SYRIAM ET PHOENICEM OPTINENS
 BELLVM GESSIT CVM GENTE HOMONADENSIVM
 QVAE INTERFECERAT AMYNTAM
 REGEM, QVA REDACTA IN POTESTATEM DITIONEMQVE DIVI
 AVGVSTI POPVLIQVE ROMANI, SENATUS DIS IMMORTALIBVS
 SVPLICATIONES BINAS OB RES PROSPERE GESTAS AB EO ET
 IPSI ORNAMENTA TRIVMPHALIA DECREVIT
 PROCONSVL ASIAM PROVINCIAM OPTINVIT LEGATVS PR. PR.
 DIVI AVGVSTI ITERVM SYRIAM ET PHOENICEM OPTINVIT.

¹ Cf. Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, p. 115; Schürer, *op. cit.*

Our chief interest in the restoration of this inscription lies in the fact that it makes Quirinius governor of Syria, about the time of which Saint Luke speaks. Yet, even if this be granted, it by no means disposes of the difficulty in regard to the date of the census. For according to Saint Luke, the birth of Christ and the census took place before the death of Herod, in A. U. C. 750.¹ On the other hand, Josephus tells us that Quintilius Varus succeeded Sentius Saturninus as governor about two years before the death of Herod, and that he was still in office at the decease of that king.² Hence the census did not take place under Quirinius, and there is a contradiction between Saint Luke and Josephus.

But in view of the fact that the earlier term of Quirinius as governor of Syria is almost established by the aforementioned inscription, the seeming contradiction can be explained in various ways. It has already been mentioned that Quirinius, in conducting the war against the Homonades, very probably did so as governor of Syria, and yet Varus is named as governor at the same time. The only hypothesis that can account for this seeming contradiction is that Quirinius was appointed to the governorship before the death of Herod, but, owing to his being employed in a remote part of the province by military affairs, Varus still retained the civil administration at Antioch. It is certain that men were appointed by the Roman government as legates for even proconsular provinces, without at once assuming control of them. We read, too, of governors who, during their whole term of office, did not once visit their province.³ These men fulfilled their duties by means of procurators.⁴ Josephus refers to a certain Sabinus as procurator of Syria, during the troubles following the death of Herod.⁵ He speaks of a conflict between this procurator and Varus, whom he calls the governor, and in the outcome, the former appears to possess an authority equal to, if not greater than that of the latter. Yet under Roman administration the procurator was always an inferior officer of the governor.

¹ Cf. Schürer, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 464, note 165.

² *Antiq.* XVII, 5 and 9, cf. Tacitus, *Hist.*, V, 9.

³ Tacitus, *Annales*, VI, 27.

⁴ Aberle, *apud Desjardins*, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *Antiq.*, XVII, 9; Wars, II, 2.

Hence we are led to believe that Varus had not the real authority, but that Sabinus took the place of the one who was really governor. And if Quirinius were governor and absent, this contradiction is solved by the hypothesis that Sabinus was his lieutenant, and that Varus still remained in Syria because of the troubles of the last year of Herod's reign. Hence, if the census took place before the death of Herod and after Quirinius had been appointed to succeed Varus, it was proper for Saint Luke to have attached to it the name of the former, the real governor of Syria.¹

Some are inclined to consider Quirinius as having been charged with the special mission of taking the census of the people, while Varus was governor. The fact that he succeeded Varus accounts for Saint Luke's mention of him as "ἡγεμὼν εὐνοῦτος τῆς Συρίας Κυρίνου." Professor Marucchi, among others, inclines to this view, and sees in the fact that Quirinius was employed to subdue the rebellious Homonades a confirmation of his opinion.² This theory also is a tenable one, for although it was not customary for any other than the governor of a province to command the army there, yet circumstances might render it necessary. However, the fact that Saint Luke speaks of Quirinius as actually governing Syria at the time of the census is an objection against this view.

There remains a third solution of the difficulty which will also satisfactorily explain the apparent contradictions in Saint Luke's account. Even if Quirinius was not made legate of Syria until A. U. C. 750, Saint Luke might have attributed the census to him without error. A census at that time would not be the work of a single day, nor even of a single year. Nothing therefore is to hinder us from believing that the census was ordered and begun under Varus, or perhaps under Sentius Saturninus, and not completed until the time of Quirinius. The years B. C. 9 to 8 are the ones to which the first census period of Augustus has been assigned by Professor Ramsay, and we have seen that Sentius Saturninus governed Syria B. C. 9 to 8. Tertullian states expressly that the census took place under Saturninus and refers to the Roman archives for confirmation of his testimony.

¹ This solution is adopted by Aberle, Gloag, Desjardins, Vigouroux, &c., loc. cit.

² In "*Bessarione*," loc. cit.

This, too, is a probable hypothesis, and it is quite possible that Saint Luke's knowing that the census was completed under Quirinius, assigned it to him. True the word here used, "*ἐγένετο*" primarily means "took place," not "was completed," but Saint Luke has used it, in another place, in the sense of "was completed."¹ He may have done so in this case also.

It is easy to perceive, then, that Saint Luke's reliability in the question of the census of Quirinius is not difficult of demonstration. Whichever of the solutions proposed is accepted by the student, he can see that the boast of Saint Luke's accusers cannot be made good. They who deny so readily Saint Luke's accuracy do so without a proper regard for history. When it is question of the credibility of a sacred writer, with an obviously unfair spirit they demand an enormous mass of confirmatory evidence before they will accept his statement, while they receive with no hesitation, that of such a writer as Josephus, who has been proved to be unreliable in many instances. For the proper study of history a sceptical frame of mind is necessary, but not the scepticism which denies the credibility of a writer just because he happens to be a Christian.

That we are unable to fix with more precision the details of this and many other events of the history of the Church in the first centuries is due to the meagre accounts that we have of this period and to the unsettled state of its chronology. It is to be noted that the researches of the best scholars in the domain of early history tend ever to vindicate the trustworthiness of the sacred writers. It is but a short time since the Acts of the Apostles was attacked by the Tübingen rationalistic school as a forgery of late date, yet today its authenticity is proved beyond a doubt. So, too, we may hope that later discoveries will throw new light on this question of the census. Through the able critical work of Professor Mommsen on the Tivoli fragment one great difficulty has been almost removed; without doubt other monuments exist capable of clearing up those which remain.

DONALD MCKINNON.

¹ Acts, XI, 28.

A RECENT WORK ON THE TRINITY.¹

The revealed doctrine of the divine Three-in-one became a matter of universal attention and inquiry early in Christian thought. The sublimity of the idea in itself, the beauty of its expression in the pages of Holy Writ, the distracting heresies that like so many additional clouds descended upon it, contributed one and all to place it in the foremost rank of discussion and investigation. The best intellects of the East and the West devoted themselves ardently to its study, searching the Scriptures for stray bits of meaning and piecing these latter together into a grand mosaic, whence the mind might gaze upon the revealed picture as a whole and be stimulated to further inquiry into its rational background. Education, environment, differences of language and the desire to refute hostile theories indigenous, so to speak, to the soil of East and West alike, quite naturally brought about a variety of viewpoints and a number of slight divergences in exposition, which superficial critics have as superficially magnified into utter and irreconcilable opposition. Some would fain have it that the Trinitarian views of the Greek and Latin Fathers, like an acid and an alkali mixed, neutralize each other. Yet a detailed investigation lays bare the fact that the varied dogmatic formulae employed express identically the same meaning, howsoever much at times they differ in phrasing and formulation.

Unfortunately in these days of ours hypothesis has been made the supreme arbiter and interpreter of facts. Whole periods of history are condensed into a single phrase and subsumed under some simple category. In the tendency towards scientific classification of the epochs of history, men are guilty of too much compression and do not seem to advert sufficiently to the fact that this species of mental shorthand or abbreviation results in an unfair transcript of the facts considered.

¹ "Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité." Par Théodore de Régnon, S. J. 3 vols. in 8vo. Victor Retaux. Paris, 1898

The fallacy of the universal is abroad disguised, yet undetected. Critics are constantly identifying the simplifications of mental analysis with the real forms and facts of existence, as if forsooth all further knowledge were impossible and the knowableness of a subject exhausted utterly by bottling it in a general phrase or boxing it in a category of classification. Witness the dismissal of the Greek and Latin Fathers with such generalities as the following: The Greeks were practical; the Latins prone to pure speculation. The Greeks were cosmic theists seeking their God within the universe. The Latins were anthropomorphic theists conceiving God as an extra-mundane entity of mannish type, dwelling in inaccessible majesty somewhere beyond the empyrean heaven. Or, what is more pertinent to the present issue: the idea of the Trinity among the Greeks was the result of an effort to unite three divergent streams of philosophy, to which the more concrete appellations of Father, Son and Holy Ghost were happily given. Contentions such as these used to be dealt with on the practical principle of "*solvitur ambulando*." To-day they might more feasibly be answered by the paraphrase: "*Solvitur legendo*." How writers of to-day can pass over the revealed elements in the Trinitarian problem, taken for granted by all the Fathers whether Latin or Greek, and confine themselves solely to the *rational* elements which the Fathers introduced to elaborate and make somewhat intelligible this transcendent truth, passes all understanding. And the result, quite naturally to be expected in such a case of culpable oversight, is to put before the Fathers an abstract problem which they never so much as entertained and which exists only in the mind of those who persist in fastening it upon them.

It must be clear, even on the slightest acquaintance with the patristic texts, that the problem before the Fathers was not: How the Trinity is a naturally suggestive rational hypothesis growing out of the need of bringing together in friendly unison three divergent currents of the old Greek philosophy. Else, why do the Fathers not mention this universal *motif*? On the contrary, it was in reality and in truth: How, granting the idea of three Persons in one God as revealed in the Sacred Pages, such a sublime conception may be elaborated in the

workshop of reason, and translated into more or less intelligible terms of human speech. They did not regard the existence of the Trinity in point of fact as demonstrable by human reason. Its existence was no postulate of philosophic inquiry, but a fact of Revelation. The fact once admitted as revealed, they proceeded to formulate theories as to its rational conception, nothing else. True it is that the dividing lines between philosophy and theology were not marked off with full precision up to the days of St. Thomas in the thirteenth century. True it is likewise that the respective fields of Reason and Revelation occasionally overlapped, as was the case with Anselm and with Richard of St. Victor. Yet, St. Thomas takes care to point out the extravagance of Richard's contention that the existence and nature of the Trinity were rationally demonstrable. Not so, he says: we simply advance arguments of convenience and analogy, explanatory to some extent of the fact which the Scriptures make known to us, but not rigorous demonstrations. In this he expressed the attitude of his ancient forbears, and placed the Trinity on the plane of super-rational truths. Reason never could attain unto the knowledge of such a triune existence unaided. Much less could it have evolved such a notion out of inner consciousness as a go-between for the reconciliation of philosophic divergences. It is certainly not conducive to the maintenance of one's philosophic temper to find the contrary proclaimed by so many nowadays as the very essence of research, nay, as the last of profundity itself.

In consequence of the foregoing observations, it is easy to see that a false conception of the point at issue with the Fathers in their discussion of the Trinitarian doctrine, as well as the employment of an unscholarly method in its presentation, are responsible for the fantastic views—none the less false because fanciful and hypothetical—of rationalistic writers. Fault of method is the original sin of all such "critics" and vitiates the entire series of their adverse conclusions. Given an issue that never existed and a pliant and elastic hypothesis that may be bent to serve any purpose, verbal and not rational conclusions are turned out in abundance "as per contract or schedule." The prepossessions of the critic are read into the

texts before him and read out again with a display of erudition and of critical insight calculated to deceive even the elect. Fiction, unfortunately be it said, is stranger than truth, and, in many instances, stronger.

No field of knowledge is more open and inviting to the man with ready-made hypotheses and theories than is perhaps the field of patristic literature, and that part of it especially which concerns the explicit unfolding of the idea of the Trinity. The doctrine of the Logos at once suggests Philo. It is immediately set down as borrowed from his pages. The Fathers employ philosophy to express in rational terms the revealed dogma of three divine persons in one nature, quoting Plato and, to some extent, Aristotle in support of the definitions which they are compelled to elaborate and to apply in turn to the doctrine of the Trinity. Is not this proof evident that the idea of the Trinity is nothing else than a muddled medley of Greek philosophy? And then again: the schoolmen in the great controversy over universals constantly allude to the Trinity as the supreme and divine exemplar of Realism. They rise en masse in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries against Roscelin for having reduced the divine Oneness to a mere name and for having asserted reality only of the three individual divine Persons. They asserted, in opposition to Roscelin, that the divine nature was a reality as well as the three Persons subsisting in it—although these divine Persons were not really distinct from, but identical with this real nature. What is this but a tacit confession that the idea of the Trinity was excogitated to satisfy the needs of a crudely realistic spirit of philosophizing? And so on without number. Consequences are piled high upon distorted facts; sweeping conclusions are drawn from slender premises; a whole science of psychology relative to the ends and aims and motives of the Fathers is constructed, until verily one feels constrained to take comfort in the refreshing contrast of this age of light and reflection as set over against that early period of tiresome logomachies and unreflecting belief.

We have before us a treatise on the Greek theories concerning the Trinity. It sins by none of the defects enumerated above. It does not take into account the false methods of

studying the question of the Trinity that are so much in vogue. It plunges into the heart of its subject at once, amasses, collates, sifts and criticizes texts, without prejudging the issue by any long-distance views. A short biography is given of each Father, accompanied by a bibliography. Nothing is forced out of its environment and the conclusions, with few exceptions, are well tempered to the facts.

The divine processions and relations ; the controversy over "Agenetos" and "Agennetos ;" the meaning of the respective divine names Word, Image, Love, Gift ; the various dogmatic formulae, together with the theories excogitated by the Greeks and Latins to make somewhat conceivable this divine mystery, are well exposed from the positive theologian's standpoint. In fact, it is a detailed critical study of the entire patristic literature on this topic. There is an abundance of information concerning those consecrated theological phrases that have long since crystallized into a fixed terminology. Additional interest is given the subject by tracing out its gradual unfolding from the implicit to the explicit. Care is taken to bring out the salient fact that the orthodox view always conceived and represented the divine processions as taking place in a straight line, while the heterodox view, especially that of the heresiarch Photius, abandoned this conception for that of a triangle with one side removed. God the Father was regarded as the apex, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost as two opposite processions therefrom, which Photius was fond of presenting under the shape of an inverted A. Confronted by the text "*de meo accipiet*,"¹ Photius seems to have faltered, but only for a while, as he soon again stiffens his false belief by amending the text so as to make it read "*de meo (patre) accipiet ;*" in support of which innovation he displays a veritable pageant of erudite subtleties. It was this symbolic angle of Photius that imperceptibly inclined the heterodox Greeks to certain fixed habits of judgment respecting the divine processions, which had much to do with their implacable hostility to the "Filioque," or the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.

¹ John, XVI, 14.

Suffice it to say in fine that this work of Père Régnon is a very full presentation of the subject, and cannot fail to be a source of much positive information to students and professors alike. Brought into small compass, tersely written and orderly exposed, this treatise has but one defect—the absence of a topical index. This defect is remedied to some extent by a synoptic table of general reference at the end of each volume.

Before closing this study, however, attention should be called to a special departure of the author from a position long since regarded as fixed. It will be recalled that Suarez and Franzelin regard the divine procession of the Son as conceivable under the formal ratio of the intellect, and that of the Holy Ghost under the formal ratio of the will or love. It will be recalled that Suarez attaches theological censure to the opposite view of Durandus, and that Franzelin, though dropping the note of censure, adopts substantially the view of Suarez. Père Régnon is well aware that this received position dates back to Augustine and to the beautiful psychological theory which he advances in explanation of the divine processions. The author does not question in the least the beauty or the relevancy of the Augustinian theory, but he denies with considerable emphasis that there is sufficient patristic and scholastic unanimity in its favor to warrant its being made a necessary part, to the exclusion of all others, of the theological explanations of the Trinitarian dogma. Speaking of course only from the point of view of positive theology, he styles the demonstration of Suarez jejune, and that of Franzelin inconclusive. The most that may be claimed for the theory of Augustine, he avers, is simply that it is first among its peers. To claim for it a universal acceptance exclusive of all others, he says, is to shut one's eyes to the divergences in tradition respecting it, to tax with error the two councils of Toledo and to commit the egregious fault in method of interpreting the Fathers and the Schoolmen merely to suit requirements. Besides, St. Thomas himself admitted that this explanation of Augustine, which he himself followed, was only an analogy, to be dealt with as such. The value of the texts usually cited in favor of the Suaresian contention, concludes the author, is still very much a matter of debate from the point of view of

historical research, whatever be thought of their dogmatic significance. Many will disagree seriously with this contention of the author, especially as he seems to set too great store by the divergent views of St. Bonaventure, and seems to exact the letter, not being content with the spirit of the patristic phrases.

Père Régnon has left us in these three volumes of his a valuable contribution to positive theology. He called himself in his modesty "*un coureur des bois*," rambling here and there in quest of a look-out whence the perspective clears. But he was far more than this. He had the genius for detail as well developed as that of speculation. He was not a man to gaze upon his own ideas reflected into the patristic texts with scientific complaisance. He had taught the physical sciences for years and the habits of keen observation which this branch of study develops in its devotees, he carried with him in his theological investigations. In fact, there is a generous sprinkling of the current ideas of physical science in the similes which he employs to illustrate his meaning, such as "undulatory vibration," "indefinite stability," "prolongation in a straight line," and in his attempt, a few days before his death, to express in the parlance of the physicist the idea of the Holy Ghost, as "the term condensing all the divine energy and sending it back to its source, thus conserving eternally the divine supersubstantial movement." At times he betrays an insufficient acquaintance with the development of the mediæval period of theology and philosophy, as when he draws a sharp contrast between the ethical views of St. Anselm and St. Thomas, to the disparagement of the latter, assigning to St. Thomas an almost utter divorce of moral theology from ethics. This is inexact and misleading, as it was just this confusion by Anselm of the sphere of pure belief with the domain of purely natural investigation that led St. Thomas to distinguish in object, principles and method, the field of theology from that of philosophy. Distinction is not separation. The idea of St. Thomas was a great advance over Anselm's, yet Père Régnon, losing the larger historical perspective in the haphazard contrast of a few texts, would regard it as an unfruitful delimitation of a more abundant field.

While not agreeing with all the author's conclusions, we are pleased to see made public such a substantial piece of research in positive theology, bearing the earmarks of genuine scholarship, full of detail and correspondingly void of hypothesis, thus forming a refreshing contrast to the molehill of facts and the mountain of conclusions too often met with in rationalistic writers.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

LABOR BUREAUS IN THE UNITED STATES.¹

The demand for detailed and accurate information concerning social conditions, in particular the condition of the laboring class, has become so general and has created such a multitude of agencies to supply it that we no longer wonder at the zeal and ingenuity displayed in the study of social questions. We are not surprised at seeing the professor take up his residence with the laboring man for months, in order to enter into the latter's world and see how he lives; it is not unusual for the student of social conditions to cross the ocean in steerage quarters in order to learn how the poor are treated; the scholar enters the factory as a workman for the purpose of studying its spirit. Studies, lectures, books, newspapers are all devoted to spreading information on every side. This demand for such knowledge is more than popular, something other than a passing fad. Economists, sociologists, historians, legislators and statesmen are seriously at work, seeking a knowledge of social conditions and attempting to correct and develop science, to make laws and shape State policy in the light of the facts of modern life. Without attempting to be exhaustive or critical, we may broadly classify the kinds of investigation carried on, into three groups. First, we have private study of social conditions, conducted by individuals, associations, schools. We might mention as belonging to this class such studies as Booth's "In Darkest England," Professor Wyckoff's "The Workers," Gohre's *Drei Monate Fabrikarbeiter*, Levasseur's "L'Ouvrier Américain;" the list is endless. Here belong also the work of such societies as the American Economic Association, the American Statistical Society, the American Academy of Social and Political Science; the work of university stu-

¹ Authentic sources of information are: the laws creating the bureaus, all of which may be found in the second special Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor, 1896; the Reports of the various bureaus; Reports of the conventions of the National Association of Officials of Bureaus of Labor Statistics; Report of the *Congrès International de législation du Travail*, held in Brussels September 27 to 30, 1897, pp. 465 and 718.

dents; in a word, all efforts of private individuals or societies to study social conditions. The value of this kind of work depends on the character of the student; his judgment, methods of research, his accuracy and ability in grouping and presenting facts. A second group of agents of investigation is had in temporary legislative committees, created by law, whose duty it is to study a given condition or problem, report on it and suggest laws. Such committees are frequently formed in our States; such was the Senate committee created in 1883, which heard and published over 4,000 pages of testimony on the relations of capital and labor; another was the commission formed to investigate the Chicago strike;¹ the present Industrial Commission now sitting and to continue during not more than two years, is another institution of this kind. Such committees or commissions do not as a rule aim at statistical accuracy. They seek opinions of representative men, aiming to reach a correct knowledge of conditions thereby, and upon such conclusions they base suggestions for legislation. The first kind of investigation is purely private, the second is official, but temporary. A third form is official and permanent, its duty being the regular methodical investigation of social conditions. This institution is called the Labor Bureau. In the United States there are thirty-three State bureaus and one Federal bureau, while nearly every foreign government has created one after the model furnished by this country. The remarkable development which the bureaus have had and the importance of their work make them an object worthy of attention. Their organization, history, work and publications, their shortcomings offer opportunity for most interesting descriptive and critical study. I confine myself in this article, however, to a simple description of their nature, number, work and difficulties, attempting no critical appreciation of their publications, organization or methods.

A labor bureau may be defined as a permanent office created by law whose general purpose is the collection and publication of information concerning social conditions. In some states it is a subdivision of the executive branch of the Government.

¹ Created by executive act of the President, by virtue of the law creating the Department of Labor.

In Nebraska the governor is *ex-officio* commissioner of labor ; in Colorado the Secretary of State is chief, while in Pennsylvania it is the Secretary of Internal Affairs. In Indiana the office is in the general bureau of statistics. Generally, however, the bureau of labor is a distinct department, with suitable quarters in the state-house, and the commissioner is appointed by the governor, to whom reports are made. There is considerable difference in the scope of the various bureaus. They may really be regarded as a concession to the labor forces of the country ; their institution is certainly due in a measure to the agitation and demands of labor. The primary duty of every bureau, then, is to collect and publish information on the condition of labor in the broadest sense of the term. But in nearly every case the scope has been widened. In many States the law creating the bureau requires that it collect and publish information on the general condition of the industry of the State, its resources and advantages. In some cases the bureau must aim to advertise the State, encourage immigration, carry on correspondence, attempt to attract capital, secure advantageous rates on railroads for prospective settlers. Others are required to conduct investigations of the condition of agriculture, crops, soil, etc. Again, the office of factory inspector is included in the labor bureau, the commissioner of labor being inspector, or at least responsible for factory inspection. In some States the bureau is also a free employment agency, where laboring men seeking work may register and employers seeking men may apply. In Colorado the labor bureau may act as mediator in labor disputes, if invited. In many cases the law requires investigations to extend to prisons, jails and reformatories. We do not find all of these duties performed by any one bureau, but viewed in their ensemble they present the variety to which reference is made. The official titles of the bureaus give a clue to the character of the work imposed upon them by law. In all cases the bureau is a labor bureau, but many States add the word Inspection, Agriculture, Mines or Immigration, thereby indicating the nature of the investigations undertaken. Without attempting any further analysis of functions, I confine myself to citing from some laws which are thoroughly representative. The citations will convey an

exact idea of the fields of investigation of the bureaus. The Michigan law contains the following: "The duties of such bureau shall be to collect, . . . assort, systematize, print and present in annual reports to the governor . . . statistical details relating to all departments of labor in this State, including the penal institutions thereof, particularly concerning the hours of labor, the number of laborers and mechanics employed, the number of apprentices in each trade, . . . wages earned, the savings from the same, the culture, moral and mental, with age and sex of laborers employed, the number and character of accidents, the sanitary condition of institutions where labor is employed, as well as the influence of the several kinds of labor and the use of intoxicating liquors upon the health and mental condition of the laborer, . . . the proportion of married laborers and mechanics who live in rented houses, with the average annual rental of same, . . . the subjects of co-operation, strikes or other labor difficulties, trades unions and other labor organizations and their effects upon labor and capital, with such other matter relating to the commercial, industrial and sanitary condition of the laboring classes and permanent prosperity of the respective industries of the State as such bureau may be able to gather, accompanied by such recommendations relating thereto as the bureau shall deem proper." The law creating the Federal bureau in Washington contains a section according to which, the aim of that bureau shall be "to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with labor, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and especially upon its relation to capital, the hours of labor, the earnings of laboring men and women and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual and moral prosperity." It is also stated that the bureau shall investigate the cost of production, comparative cost of living, articles controlled by trusts, causes of and facts relating to controversies between employer and employe which tend to interfere with the welfare of the people of the different States, etc., etc.

The labor bureau has three general characteristics; it is permanent, official and educational. The meaning of the first

is clear. Its official character implies that it is created by law, its work is directed by law, expenses are paid from public funds, reports are made to public authorities in the interests of general welfare. There is absolutely no guarantee as to the scientific value of the work, its accuracy, completeness or fairness. It depends entirely on the conscience, intelligence, energy and methods of the officials in charge, as is the case with every public office. The educational character of the bureaus follows from its duty of collecting and publishing facts. This is done in the interest of no school, theory or party, but merely that legislators, students and the public may know conditions.¹ Whether or not the institution of the bureaus was a concession to labor, they are not offices whose purpose is to teach a theory or advocate a line of reform. This is clearly indicated in the organic laws of the bureaus. Though Maine, West Virginia and Kansas laws require that the Commissioner of Labor be identified with the labor interests of the State, and the Illinois law requires that three members of its board of five be manual laborers and two, employers, the settled policy and practice of the bureaus is to hold severely to the domain of fact. This is clearly seen, not only in the work of the bureaus, but as well in the proceedings of the conventions of officials of labor bureaus whose spirit is invariably in favor of holding to the work of actual investigation of facts.

It is stated that the first demand of workingmen for the creation of labor bureaus was made at a labor congress in Cleveland in 1867,² and the first bureau in the world was established in Massachusetts in 1869. The eight-hour agitation of the preceding years, the spirit of unrest, dissatisfaction, the evils known to exist in the condition of working women and children, were factors which led to the institution of the bureau in 1869. Pennsylvania was the next State to create one, in 1872. Others quickly followed; Connecticut 1873, abolished in 1875, reor-

¹ See Mr. Wright's address at the third convention of officials of Bureaus of Labor, p. 25. For an expression of the contrary view, see report of the eighth convention, where it was discussed. The relation of the bureau to the study of causes of social conditions is discussed in the reports of the tenth convention, p. 93, and the eleventh, p. 89.

² See report of eighth convention of officials of Bureaus of Labor, p. 41. I believe that a legislative committee of Massachusetts recommended the formation of a bureau in 1865.

ganized in 1885; Kentucky 1876, Ohio 1877, New Jersey 1878, Missouri, Indiana, Illinois 1879; New York, California, Michigan, Wisconsin 1883; Iowa, Maryland 1884; Kansas 1885; Rhode Island, Nebraska, Colorado, North Carolina, Maine, Minnesota 1887; West Virginia 1889; North Dakota 1890; Tennessee 1891; Montana, New Hampshire 1893; Washington 1897; Virginia 1898. South Dakota and Utah created bureaus, but they have been abolished. In 1879 the Massachusetts legislature petitioned Congress to establish a national bureau in Washington. Bills to that effect were introduced in 1880 and 1882. In 1884, the bill was passed and the Department of Labor was created. In most States, the chief of the bureau is called the commissioner of labor. He is as a rule appointed by the Governor with the consent of the council or senate. The term of office varies from two to four years and according to American political customs, the appointment follows party lines as a rule. In North Dakota, Kentucky and Indiana the chief is elected by popular vote. In Illinois a board of five is named by the Governor, three of whom must be manual laborers and two, employers; they choose a secretary—not one of themselves—who is virtually chief. In Nebraska the Governor is chief *ex officio*, but the work of the bureau is conducted by a deputy. In Colorado and Washington the Secretary of State is chief, while in Pennsylvania it is the Secretary of Internal Affairs. The Federal Commissioner is appointed by the President for a term of four years. Hon. Carroll D. Wright has been Commissioner since 1885, when the bureau was organized.

The methods of investigation employed by the bureaus are as a rule left to the choice of the chief, except in a few States whose laws distinctly state that information shall be collected by means of circulars containing questions which are mailed to parties from whom information is sought. This method is not at all expensive, hence it commends itself readily where appropriations are limited, as is frequently the case. The circular, which varies in form and character with its purpose, generally allows for and invites the expression of opinions on social conditions. The reliable answers are selected and from them reports are compiled. Names and addresses are

always omitted, lest any clue to those furnishing information be given. In some States the law requires specified institutions or parties, such as manufacturers or building and loan associations, to report the condition of business annually to the bureau of labor. In this manner valuable service is rendered, the efficiency of the bureau greatly increased and difficulties reduced. In a number of States too, town, city, district, and State officials are required to assist the bureau of labor by supplying information to be found in their hands and even by undertaking investigations with the bureau.¹ The most effective method of investigation, however, is the personal visit of an agent, ordinarily an expert, to the place or institutions being studied. He makes a methodical examination of books, documents, and places, invites the expression of views from competent persons and from the results of such examinations reports are made.

In carrying on these investigations, the bureaus have considerable powers, accorded by their organic law. They may administer the oath, send for persons, papers, records; they may have access to any public institution, factory, etc., and compel the production of business records as far as the examination which they are making, demands. Persons are not, however, forced to leave their vicinity in order to testify, nor are they required to answer questions about affairs which are strictly private. Those who refuse to coöperate or who place obstacles in the way of investigations are guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable by fine or imprisonment. In Ohio the maximum fine is \$500.²

The publications of the bureaus are called reports. Nearly two-thirds of the States issue them annually, the others biennially. In some cases the bureau reports annually to the governor, but the report is published only biennially. A few bureaus issue bulletins, which contain material of current interest. The Federal Bureau issues Annual Reports, Special Reports and a Bulletin, which appears every two months.

¹ Report of third convention of officials of Bureaus of Labor, p. 76. See also the laws creating the bureaus.

² The value of this feature and the wisdom of using the sanction in case of refusal to coöperate were discussed at length in the tenth convention of officials of the Bureau of Labor. See Report, p. 83.

The Bulletin contains original essays by men of authority on subjects falling within the field of investigation of the bureau, the resumé of current reports of State bureaus, a digest of all court decisions affecting labor, the text of new labor laws and notices of government contracts. All the publications of all the bureaus are distributed gratis upon request, to any citizen, to any institution, library or society. The only restriction is that resulting from the fact that in some States appropriations are small and hence editions of reports can not be large. The law of North Carolina requires that a copy of the report of its bureau be sent to every newspaper publisher in the State, to each member of the assembly, to each State and county officer, to any citizen who requests it, and a hundred copies to each labor organization. Up to the present, over 300 volumes of reports have been issued by the bureaus in the United States. It is useless to attempt any sketch of their contents. The reader will understand from the preceding what is in general their character. The Federal bureau and a number of State bureaus would merit particular notice for the high scientific character of their work, were I to undertake a critical examination of it. But that falls outside of the scope of this article.¹

The services rendered by the labor bureaus are valuable to history, economics, sociology, to industry, to legislatures. It would be an interesting study to trace out the abuses in social conditions which were made known by the work of the bureaus,

¹ The following is the list of publications of the Federal Bureau aside from the Bulletin:

Annual—1886, First, Industrial Depressions, pp. 496. 1886, Second, Convict Labor, pp. 612. 1887, Third, Strikes and Lockouts (January 1, 1881, to December 31, 1886), pp. 1,172. 1888, Fourth, Working Women in Large Cities, pp. 631. 1889, Fifth, Railroad Labor, pp. 888. 1890, Sixth, Cost of Production: Iron, Steel, Coal, etc., pp. 1,404; 1891, Seventh, Cost of Production: The Textiles and Glass, (2 vols.), pp. 2,048. 1892, Eighth, Industrial Education, pp. 707. 1893, Ninth, Building and Loan Associations, pp. 719. 1894, Tenth, Strikes and Lockouts (January 1, 1887, to June 30, 1894, 2 vols., pp. 1,909. 1895-96, Eleventh, Work and Wages of Men, Women and Children, pp. 671. 1897, Twelfth, Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem, pp. 275. 1898, Thirteenth, Hand and Machine Labor (est.), pp. 1,400.

Special—1889, First, Marriage and Divorce, pp. 1,074. 1892, Second, Labor Laws of the United States, (second edition, revised, 1896), pp. 1,383. 1893, Third Analysis and Index of all Reports issued by Bureaus of Labor Statistics in the United States prior to November 1, 1892, pp. 376. 1893, Fourth, Compulsory Insurance in Germany, etc., pp. 370. 1893, Fifth, The Gothenburg System of Liquor Traffic, pp. 253. 1893, Sixth, The Phosphate Industry of the United States (with maps and illustrations), pp. 145. 1894, Seventh, The Slums of Baltimore, Chicago, New York and Philadelphia, pp. 620. 1895, Eighth, The Housing of the Working People (with plans and illustrations), pp. 461. 1897, Ninth, The Italians in Chicago, pp. 409.

to show their influence in labor legislation and to examine the practical services rendered by them to the industrial and social development of the States. The reports are eagerly sought by universities, public men, students, libraries, foreign scholars and governments. The good done by the bureaus has been accomplished in spite of great difficulties which are all but disheartening. It may assist the reader to appreciate the work of the bureaus justly if the obstacles which are in their way be understood.

One might say that the field of investigation should be more definitely determined and that the bureaus should not be required to exercise too many functions.¹ Too many lines of investigation are imposed on a large number of bureaus, too many duties exacted, particularly since the bureau is greatly hampered by lack of funds. There should be a reaction against this undue expansion, so that investigations might be kept in the narrower circle of problems in the condition and relations of capital and labor. In addition, the bureaus require men, money and co-operation from outside. The work is important and difficult; trained investigators are needed. Care is necessary in the choice of subjects, in the manner of investigation and of presentation. Men are needed who have the gift of quick and accurate insight into conditions; men thoroughly acquainted with the methods of statistics and their limitations. Honest men are necessary, men who are stronger than any theory they hold and who can bravely present the result of their investigations in an objective manner. The process of selection which obtains in the United States does not always insure the choice of such men as commissioners; or when chosen it does not secure them in their position. The salary is not large enough to attract men of great capability unless they are willing and able to make pecuniary sacrifices. The incumbent of the office depends upon political fortunes, hence the uncertainty of tenure of office is a deterrent. But the American is versatile. He is quick to learn when he will and he soon schools himself in the spirit, methods and work of his office. No sooner master of it than he is dismissed and his experience is lost.

¹ An instance of the way in which factory inspection hinders investigation may be found in the report of the eighth convention of officials, etc., p. 80.

Insufficient funds is a serious drawback. The appropriations are, as a rule, limited. This sometimes forces the bureaus to forego an investigation which might be expensive; it compels it to employ less perfect ways of investigation and necessarily limits the expenses that the commissioner may incur, either in travel, hiring agents or publishing reports. The bureaus complain of a general lack of co-operation and of indifference, even opposition from sources to which inquiry must be addressed. Labor organizations have at times antagonized the bureaus, though in general they are willing helpers;¹ occasionally the individual resents the inquiry as an intrusion. Employers at times refuse to furnish information or assistance of any sort. The general public seems indifferent, when not a third or a fourth of the circulars sent out are returned.² The strangest kind of accusations are sometimes made. It is claimed that the purpose of the bureau is to organize strikes, to work for capitalists, to reduce wages and increase taxes, etc., etc.³ All this has arisen from a misunderstanding of the work and nature of the bureaus and a prejudice based on pure imagination. Fortunately, both are being dissipated and there is promise of wider co-operation. Even when the law has required city, county and state officials to aid the bureaus, they have shown reluctance and have done only imperfect work.⁴ The Federal bureau has been singularly free from most of these difficulties. Appropriations by Congress have been ample. The bureau has been under the direction of its eminent chief, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, since 1885. There are over a hundred persons in the office force and trained scholars do much of the work.

Though no official relations of any kind exist among the bureaus of the United States, their officers have recognized the need of coöperation and coördination in the work done. To bring this about they formed in 1883 the National Association of Officials of Bureaus of Labor Statistics. It holds

¹ See report of ninth convention of officials, etc., p. 77; also eighth convention, p. 28.

² One commissioner stated at a convention of officials of bureaus that it is throwing stamps away to attempt to use circular letters. Report of seventh convention, p. 45.

³ See report of tenth convention of officials, etc., p. 12, address of Mr. Wright.

⁴ Third convention report, p. 76.

annual conventions whose purpose is—to quote from its rules—“the discussion of methods of work, current and otherwise, pertaining to bureaus of labor or industrial statistics and kindred departments with which its members are connected in their respective States; also to foster the ties of friendship, interchange ideas and in various ways seek to promote the welfare of these bureaus of statistics; to present subjects for investigation and to transact all such business as is deemed consistent with the duties of statisticians.” The reports of the conventions, to which frequent reference has been made in these pages, are valuable since they contain the best expression of the views and work, methods and difficulties of all the chiefs of bureaus.

America has led the world in governmental statistical work, hence it is not strange that we should have had the first labor bureaus. Canada established one in 1882, Switzerland in 1886, New Zealand in 1892, Great Britain in 1893, though some work had been done as early as 1886; Germany in 1891, France in 1891, Belgium in 1895, though its conseil superieur du travail was established in 1892. Spain and Austria have created bureaus more recently. The character, composition, work and powers of these bureaus vary, but they are all essentially labor bureaus as we use the term. The organization and methods of American bureaus have been of much service in the creating of European bureaus and due credit is usually given this country for the service implied. As yet, no international organization of labor bureaus has been effected, but we may hope that the day is not far distant when this will be brought about. The problem has been discussed because of its close relation to the graver problem of international labor legislation. The idea of an international bureau originated in Switzerland in 1889. It was discussed at the famous Berlin conference of 1890, at which a resolution was adopted recommending that all the nations represented at the conference make regular investigations of the questions discussed, and that the governments exchange with one another, all legislative and administrative measures taken in view of accepted principles and all reports of those appointed to execute them. Nothing more was done. A social-

ist congress in Brussels in 1891 adopted a resolution favoring the appointment of national secretaries of labor in different countries. An international congress interested in custom regulations, held in Antwerp in 1892, declared in favor of a well systematized international organization of bureaus. The International Statistical Institute expressed the same sentiment at Berne in 1895, as did the congress in Zurich in 1897. The last attempt was made in the International Congress of Labor Legislation held in Brussels in September, 1897. The seventh question proposed and discussed was, "Is it desirable that international relations be established among the bureaus of labor and that there be an international organization of the statistics of labor?" The leading paper on the question was read by Professor Denis of Brussels, favoring such action. In the discussion of the paper, it was evident that though all regarded it as desirable, the obstacles presenting themselves seemed too great to permit any hope of immediate realization.¹ The regulations of the congress allowed no vote on the questions discussed, hence no recommendation was adopted.

Labor bureaus have so entered modern life that we may regard them as permanent. The line of development has been from the simple State bureau to the international. It is only necessary now to begin the work of elimination, direction and correction. Their duties must be more exactly defined and such work as does not closely bear on the condition of labor must be transferred to other agents. The errors in our system must be corrected so that efficient men be insured, the best quality of work be obtained and methods be perfected. The public must be ready and willing to coöperate in every way in order that the work be well done. At best, the work is difficult. When needless obstacles shall have been removed and the bureaus are properly organized and thoroughly equipped, we may expect great aid in our studies of social conditions. As the United States led in creating bureaus, may it lead in perfecting them. If it does, another hope may not be vain, namely, that we may be first to find the solution of the great problem that labor presents to our age and thus bring industrial peace to the world.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

¹ See Report of the Congress, pp. 465 and 718, from which these facts are drawn.

THE ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES.

"Representatives of fifty-three Catholic Colleges of the United States assembled at Chicago, Ill., April 12 and 13, 1899, for the purpose of discussing topics connected with collegiate education. Four sessions were held, a permanent organization was effected, and it was resolved that this organization be known as The Association of Catholic Colleges of the United States."¹

It is with genuine pleasure that we cite these opening words from the volume of "Proceedings" which has just been issued and which contains a full report of the Chicago conference. A glance at these two hundred pages is sufficient to show the importance of the undertaking. Every section of the country was represented, and the various teaching bodies engaged in the education of Catholic youth took an active part in the work. While the subjects presented at this first meeting were naturally general in character, the discussions were earnest and dignified. The papers read at the conference show breadth of view and a clear understanding of the situation. On many points practical suggestions were thrown out, all the more worthy of consideration because they are the results of experience. And while the difficulties facing the Catholic College were frankly admitted, there was an evident desire and determination to advance and improve.

Educational conventions are the order of the day. Their value is fully appreciated by those who are in charge of non-Catholic institutions. Local gatherings of public school teachers, State conventions, the National Association, and various college associations, with their annual meetings or more frequent sessions, are evidences of the interest that American educators take in their work. Organized effort, not isolation, is felt to be the secret of success. Outspoken

¹ Report of the First Annual Conference of the Association of Catholic Colleges of the United States: Washington, D. C., Catholic University Press. 1899. 8°. pp. 209.

criticism, given and taken in the proper spirit, is mutual encouragement and help. As education itself is essentially a development, the educational system is constantly growing and therefore constantly gaining in vitality as it is adapted to changing needs. These "relations in the environment" affect also our Catholic schools; and it is gratifying to see, in the association formed at Chicago, the *responsum vite* which means so much. It cannot be said that Catholics, united in faith and religious practice, are heedless of unity in matters of education. It will rather be acknowledged that the same spirit of coöperation which finds our people all over the land in works of charity, devotion, social reform and material benefit, is now to render the work of our educators more effective.

Efficiency is largely dependent upon system. In any college or school, the classes and grades must be coördinated; and in the entire scheme of education all parts, from the lowest to the highest, must be so systematized as to render any breach of continuity impossible. Where teaching is a function of government, this is a comparatively simple matter—the State shapes the mould and whosoever would teach or be taught is cast accordingly. In this country, we enjoy greater freedom, and for this very reason we have greater need of bringing our volunteer forces into a compact system. Disjointed fragments, excellent as each may be in its own way, are of little value. Sporadic efforts—spurts of energy with no regard for the general and final result—are wasted. Only sincere devotion to the common weal can endow particular interests with worth and crown individual efforts with lasting success. Had the Chicago conference accomplished nothing else, it would still have been of the greatest utility by strengthening and deepening the consciousness of the purpose to which everything else in Catholic education must be subordinate.

Uniformity in certain essentials is highly desirable. It does not imply a stereotyped curriculum, nor an inviolable set of regulations, nor any exclusively approved text-book. On all such matters there is and should be a wide liberty of choice, just as there must be full opportunity for preserving, modifying or developing plans of study and discipline which have

long been tried. But the uniformity that quickens is rather in the spirit of readiness to advance and to maintain standards, not because they happen to be generally accepted, but because they are the highest. To multiply courses and enlarge announcements is often useful and sometimes necessary ; to make each course thorough by the application of the best methods and to bring out the whole capacity of the student's mind, is still more essential. The time may yet come when it shall be said of every Catholic college graduate—no matter who signed his diploma—this man has been properly trained.

A serious difficulty in bringing about such uniformity lies outside the college. Entrance requirements have always to be drawn up in view of the work done by the preparatory schools ; and here we come upon a variety that is not pleasing. It is safe to say that most college professors have, at one time or another, felt that their own labors would be far more fruitful if the early training of the would-be freshman were of a different sort. The duty of supplying deficiencies is neither delightful nor encouraging. Between levelling up and levelling down, the result is about as satisfactory as that which is obtained in some of our cities by grading the streets.

The immediate remedy is not far to seek. Preparatory schools will really prepare when better opportunities are afforded their teachers of becoming familiar with the work of the college. Both the primary and the secondary education are greatly improved when college graduates are entrusted with the work of preparation. These are the best alumni that the college can have ; for by carefully training their scholars they lighten the labor of the collegiate course, and enable it to reach a higher degree of efficiency. But this simply emphasizes, from another point of view, the necessity of adjusting all our schools into a coöperative system. It is in the very nature of education that improvement at one stage or in one class of institutions calls for improvement in all ; the forward movement must take place along the whole line. When the college asks for advance on the part of the preparatory schools, it makes no attempt to shift a responsibility ; it rather accentuates the importance of those schools and its own dependence upon their results. The college professor who most clearly

understands his own responsibility, is the first to recognize the merit and dignity of those who lay the foundations.

The preparatory school has one advantage which the college does not always enjoy: it is in close contact with the regular work of the clergy—its management is a parochial duty. There is no duty more onerous, and its faithful discharge is an honor to our priests. Not the least difficult of its problems—a problem that is always recurring—is the selection of teachers. The fact that these schools are an expense voluntarily borne by our people, makes it imperative that every person whom they employ should be fully qualified. On the other hand, elementary training is only the beginning of a development which reaches maturity in collegiate study. The pastor who has at heart the best interests of his parish school, realizes that those interests are bound up with the work of the college. Whatever support he gives the college is a good investment; for its graduates, either as teachers or as business and professional men, are sooner or later the best parishioners.

The Association of Catholic Colleges is not a segregation; it implies no withdrawal from the general activity of the Church in this country. On the contrary, this first meeting serves to show more clearly the solidarity of all our Catholic interests. If the teacher is necessarily held apart from that constant intercourse with the people which the ministry involves, his function is none the less important for the growth and vigor of religion. The need of a more perfect system in Catholic education is felt primarily by the educators themselves; but in supplying it they strengthen every fibre in the organism of the Church. These "Proceedings," therefore, are not merely a "souvenir volume" intended for the teacher's desk alone; they have a meaning for every one who believes that knowledge and faith are equally essential in education.

To our Catholic people, the Chicago meeting should be an encouragement. It proves that the teachers to whom our young men are entrusted by their parents, appreciate the seriousness and the sacredness of their charge. In consulting for their mutual benefit, the colleges have also furthered the interests of their patrons. It is no longer a single institution or group of institutions that makes an appeal; Catholic collegiate education, as a whole, is put before the people. That a college

here and there should have lagged or failed, is a misfortune with an explanation; the principle, at any rate, survived. Now that the principle is embodied in an association, new confidence is inspired. Practically, a pledge has been given which should settle all doubts and misgivings. It came none too soon; but it came in time to arouse hopes and anticipations which only combined endeavor, such as the Association promises, can finally realize. Those especially among the people will look eagerly for the results of this conference and for the progress to be secured by future conferences, whose observation or personal experience has taught them that, in other educational systems, stability and success are due, in great measure, to active coöperation.

Among non-Catholic educators, not a few will be found in sympathy with the main purpose of the Association. There are fair-minded intelligent men who welcome every honest attempt at providing better schools for any portion of our population. There are well-meaning Protestants who are convinced that religion should form a part of education, and who therefore will note with care the development and application of the ideas for which the associated colleges stand. And there is a more numerous class of our fellow-citizens who will take an interest in these "Proceedings," if only to learn how Catholics understand education. In the standard pedagogical periodicals our views rarely find place. Catholic literature on the subject of education has hitherto been scattered in all sorts of publications, with some of which non-Catholic readers are unacquainted. But here we have what may be called an official document, inasmuch as it contains straightforward statements of our position and aims. These will naturally awaken the critical sense, but the critics, whatever their attitude in other respects, must recognize on the part of Catholic teachers a willingness to take counsel, to discuss, to point out defects and to apply remedies. As to criticism itself, no word of positive commendation or open disapprobation could be more incisive or admonitory than the silence of suspended judgment, which means, "let us wait and see."

What the future in education may be, is a hard question. In this country we have had experiments, theories, systems and reforms without end. That progress has been made in

some directions, no one can deny. And if, leaving details aside, we study the general movement, there can be little doubt as to the final outcome. All those tendencies, forces and circumstances which, during the past fifty years, have justified the existence of the Catholic college, will be multiplied and intensified as time goes on. It is not likely that the need of the religious element in education will be less urgent in the twentieth century than it is in the nineteenth: and if, to meet this need at present, unity and coöperation are necessary, the necessity, we may be sure, is not a passing one.

Apart from the aid which schools of different grades receive from the public funds, individual generosity grows with each year. The millions which are so freely given to college and university are proof that people of intelligence and wealth, without pressure or force, are determined to place American institutions of learning on a solid financial basis. They have seen clearly that the highest form of beneficence is that which provides the things of the mind, and they have understood in time that, in a country like ours, those who educate and those who are educated are the real rulers. May we not hope, as one important result of our College Association, that Catholics will be brought to take similar views? That their wealth, when it is given to education, should go to Catholic institutions is what we should naturally expect, since many of them are graduates of Catholic colleges. When it too begins to "drift" in other directions, the causes and remedies ought certainly be brought to light. To compete with honorable non-Catholic rivals is one thing; but it is quite another to find that their strength is derived in part from means and influences which, in the normal condition of things, would have been ours.

There is a form of economy from which no amount of wealth can excuse an educational system; it is the economy of energy and effort. To expend these in the right way requires largeness of mind and unselfish devotion to the cause. At a time when the supply of means is in inverse ratio to the demands made upon our colleges, such economy seems particularly needful. That it is also possible is amply demonstrated by the Chicago meeting. The success of that conference, the first of its kind in the United States, is our warrant for present congratulation and for trustful reliance upon the future of the Association.

THE CHAIR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

In the last number of the *BULLETIN* we had the satisfaction of chronicling the foundation of a Chair of American History by an American Catholic organization. It becomes our pleasing duty to announce in the present issue an equally noble and generous act on the part of the Catholic Knights of America.

During their assembly at Kansas City, June 9 to 13, they unanimously agreed to found a Chair of English Literature in the Catholic University of America.

This is the fourth time that an American Catholic organization offers to the Catholic University a chair or permanent fund whereby some teaching of the highest order is assured forever under the auspices of the Catholic Church.

It is a unique social phenomenon in an age full of striking departures from old ways of thinking and doing,—this ardor and zeal with which large bodies of Catholic men, organized for laudable or blameless purposes, take up sympathetically the most arduous problems of Church and society, and place themselves on record as intelligent coöperators in the same. It argues that the American Catholic heart is cast in no narrow and selfish mould, that it rises easily to the noblest tasks, that it is capable of that discipline and union by which individuals can accomplish the highest social works.

Not unfrequently we hear that there is something wrong with the Catholics of America. Invidious comparisons are made, unjust assertions and aspersions are cast around loosely, the name of a young but vigorous and hopeful Church is too often defamed, and the enemies of the truth made correspondingly happy. Such acts as these foundations of University chairs, in the past by the Catholic Temperance Union and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and now by the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Knights of America, speak volumes for the purity, elevation, and disinterestedness of the Catholic sentiments, which animate their members. These acts mean that the hundreds of thousands of men who compose these organizations accept fully and unquestionably the Catholic principles concerning education, that they take seriously to heart the encour-

agement of our Holy Father to contribute to the support of the University, that they have every confidence in the wisdom and justice of the American Episcopate, that they watch intelligently and are content with the administration and the growth of the Catholic University, that they ardently hope for its constant progress. They are willing to seal these sentiments by pecuniary sacrifice. This devotion and truthfulness are all the more welcome in that they are no new growth, but have been given to the University from its very inception.

While the authorities of the University prize very highly every great individual act of generosity, they cherish in a special way the corporate acts of great societies of Catholic laymen. They feel that here they come in contact with the strong and just and kind heart of the whole people, and that they receive thus an approbation of their ordinary spirit and endeavors which it would be impossible otherwise to secure until after the lapse of much time.

In founding the Chair of English Literature the Catholic Knights of America have shown an exquisite sense of what is appropriate and useful in the present circumstances. Never was literature a power so absolute and all-embracing as to-day. It slays souls and makes them live; it pulls down orders of things and institutions, and causes a new order and new institutions to rise up; it is at once the solvent and the cement of society. For three centuries English literature was the sworn enemy of Catholicism, and one of the chief obstacles to its reconquest of the human mind. We live in a milder and more humane age, when ancient passions and prejudices have in large measure disappeared. Catholicism has much to contribute to every national literature; to the English, in particular, it can bring many an element of idealism, of genuine spiritual mysticism, of contact with the historic past and the ancient institutions once common to all the English-speaking peoples. By founding the Chair of English Literature the Catholic Knights of America have bound their name, let us hope for all time, with one of the chief duties of Catholicism, the restoration of religion to the highest plane in society, and one of the chief agencies by which that work must be done—the cultivation of the good, the true, and the beautiful in the sublime art of correct thought and faultless expression.

BOOK REVIEWS.

SCRIPTURE.

The Four Gospels, A New Translation, by the Very Rev. F. A. Spencer, O. P. New York: W. H. Young & Co.

This translation of the Gospels may be taken as one of the marks indicative of the deeper and more exact study to which the Sacred Scriptures are now being subjected within the Church. Nearly all the Catholic translations generally used have been made from the Latin Vulgate compared with the Greek. And although the Vulgate is a substantially accurate reproduction of the original Greek, yet a comparative study of the Greek manuscripts and the progress made in New Testament philology, a more critical understanding of the Semitic languages, and of the political and social history of the Jews during the time of Christ, have enabled scholars to apprehend more comprehensively and to express more accurately than did St. Jerome some of the ideas conveyed by the words of the New Testament writers. As this may be said of the translation made into Latin, so it is true also of the English translation of the Latin Version. The Douay translation was very good for the period that produced it. It has been criticised, it is true, for the unnecessarily large number of Latin derivatives, and for the clumsiness of its style, yet as a whole it is a faithful rendition of the Vulgate. But the English language has been modified, the meanings of old words have changed, many words also have become so obsolete that they are now almost unintelligible; style, too, has changed, and in consequence of this natural growth the Douay version, like the "Authorized Version," has become a representative of a period in the historical development of English literature. As such it is interesting from an historical point of sight; but the revisions to which it has been subjected from time to time indicate that a more modern version is desired. Limiting ourselves to the New Testament, it is plain that the parts of which that Book is made were written for the people, to be read by them. A large part also is composed of letters written in a colloquial style capable of being generally understood by the lowest classes of the new religious communities. The Gospels, too, have the same characteristic, the sentences are simple, the style is usually direct, and the words were the common ones in daily use. Moreover, from the earliest translations it is plain that they were made

so that the most illiterate might be able to understand the good tidings conveyed by them. And in his revision of the *Vetus Itala* St. Jerome also made use of the popular language, or, as it is called, the *Lingua Romana*. From these great exemplars we may infer the manner of style in which the Testament should be translated. The language of the translation should be the language made use of in the daily life of the people for whom it is made. The translation, too, must be an accurate reproduction of the original. By this we do not mean a sentence or idiom reproduction; we mean that every idea contained in the original shall be exactly contained in the translation also. To compass this modern scholarship demands that the text to be translated be either the original one, or a copy so carefully criticised that it approaches the original as near as is possible. St. Jerome, whose translations, especially of the Psalter, make him the founder of Biblical criticism, anticipated the modern demand and revised the Old Itala Version from a text which he obtained by a careful collation of the best Greek manuscripts available. In this country much has been done toward obtaining a pure New Testament text. As in the sixteenth century the edition of Etienne, although based on no ancient manuscript, was the "textus receptus," so now the best critical texts are those of Tischendorf, based on the Codex Sinaiticus, and of Westcott and Hort, founded on the Vatican manuscript. A new English translation, therefore, should have for its basis either one of those texts, and the variant readings should be collated from other ancient manuscripts and versions.

Father Spencer seems to have used as the basic text of his translation the Greek text of the sixteenth century. He has, however, so carefully collated that text with the standard English and German critical editions of the New Testament that he has produced a version embodying some of the best results of recent scholarship. This means that he has produced the best Catholic version that has appeared since the Douay translation was made. The variant readings adopted in the text as against the authority of the Vulgate are generally those of the greatest intrinsic probability and have important manuscript authority; but there are some readings which Father Spencer has rejected, which nevertheless, as found in the Vulgate and the Received Greek text, we think probably original. Thus in Matt. xi, 19, the Received text has *τέκνον* and the Vulgate has *filius*; but most modern editors follow MSS. Aleph B, and have adopted *ἕρπον*. However, the Curetonian Syriac and the mass of Greek MSS. retain *τέκνον*. As Scrivener says (Intro. to the Crit. of the New Test., vol. i, p. 326), this is undoubtedly the true reading. The Hellenistic use of *τέκνον* was probably misunderstood by the early translators and copyists, and this would account for the origin of the variant. Again, in Mark

vi, 20, the received text has *πολλὰ ποιεῖ* and the Vulgate translates *multa faciebat*, but Codd. Aleph B. L and Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort read *πολλὰ ἡγόρευε*, which Father Spencer adopts and renders: "he was much perplexed." This emendation seems to us to be without any mark of probability. As it stands in the context it is meaningless. St. Mark says that Herod heard John gladly and protected him, and, therefore, the reading which says that he did many things which John commanded seems to be intrinsically the most probable. Father Spencer notes this reading in the margin, and we suggest that the marginal variant be placed instead of the accepted reading. Since Father Spencer is translating from the Greek, we are at a loss to account for his rendition of Luke ii, 14: "to men in whom he is well pleased." The correct reading, moreover, seems to be *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία* and not *εὐδοκίας*. In the margin Father Spencer notes nearly all the important variant readings; these are complete enough for the ordinary Bible reader, yet we think one or two more should be inserted; in particular the opinion held by most critics with regard to Mark xvi, 9-20, should have been indicated. The style of the translation is good. In the use of the personal pronouns more consistency might be suggested, but we realize the great difficulty to be overcome here. But the translation flows along evenly and is distinctly modern English. The arrangement of the book is in the main satisfactory and makes it convenient for reference. In new editions, however, we would suggest that the illustrations be omitted. Altogether this new translation brings us very close to the original, enables us to penetrate more deeply into the meaning of the sacred writers, to understand better the message they convey, and thus to acquire a more accurate knowledge of the life and works of the Master.

The Gospel of St. John, with Notes Critical and Explanatory, by the Rev. Joseph McRory, D. D., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, Maynooth College. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. New York: Benziger Bros. 386 pp.

The fourth Gospel has been the subject of many commentaries, but those in English, by Catholic authors, can be numbered on the fingers of one hand. Dr. McRory makes no pretensions to an exhaustive exegesis; he had in view mainly to give to seminary students a modern commentary on St. John of a moderate compass. Considering the object, the work has been well done; the interpretation of controverted points is generally enlightened and sane, and the matter is set forth in a clear and direct manner. In the Introduction Dr. McRory is a little over-concise. The authorship of the fourth Gospel is a point about which New Testament criticism is most warmly engaged at present. The

author does not even mention the Harnackian theory, viz., that not St. John, but John the presbyter, mentioned by Papias, was the writer of the fourth Gospel, nor does he present any special argument in defense of the validity of the testimony of St. Irenæus which Harnack attacks.

The Vulgate with its English translation has been taken as the text; it would have been better if the author had presented the original Greek. Catholic students of the New Testament need to habituate themselves to the Greek text, which often has shades of meaning or emphasis not rendered by the Latin, and which are important for a full understanding of the literary sense. There is an inconsequence in taking the Vulgate as a basis and then abandoning it in the notes in order to substitute the Greek for the elucidation of a particular passage. The incongruity seems to arise from too strict an interpretation of the Tridentine decree on the use of the Vulgate.

An interesting departure from the long prevailing exegesis is the author's reconstruction of verses third and fourth of the Prologue—a change which in point of reading is a return to the primitive, but long disused one, and in point of exegesis is a distinct improvement over the various explanations of several of the primitive fathers. As commonly read, these verses run: "All things were made by Him; and without Him was made nothing that was made. In Him was the life and the life was the light of men," etc. Dr. McRory (herein agreeing with Loisy) indicates cogent reasons for reading instead: "All things were made by Him; without Him nothing was made. What was made in that was life; and the life was the light of men," etc.

Although Dr. McRory has not neglected the ideas of other commentators, both Catholic and Protestant, he would have done well to have strengthened his interpretations by regular instead of occasional reference to authorities. Intrinsic arguments are good, but one feels additional confidence in a given opinion evolved by argument when one knows that other conscientious students hold the same.

1. Die Advents-Perikopen: Exegetisch-homiletisch erklärt, von Dr. Paul Wilhelm Keppler, Bischof von Rottenburg, Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder, 1899. 8°, pp. 143.

2. Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften, von Dr. M. Faulhaber. Ibid. 8°, pp. 218.

1. The Bishop of Rottenburg, formerly professor in the Catholic Faculty of Theology at Tübingen, and now successor of the learned Hefele, offers us in this contribution to the "Biblische Studien" (vol. IV, No. 6) a series of exegetico-homiletical discourses on the Gospels and Epistles of Advent. Under the name of "Pericopes" (περικοπαί), these

selections from the New Testament have been in immemorial use, and have furnished to preachers without number the text and inspiration for Christian instruction. Bishop Keppler in the introduction deplors the abandonment of the "homily" in favor of the formal or "thematic" sermon. He would have the preacher return again to the running commentary on the inspired text, which remains forever manual, exemplar, matter, and form of the best Christian teaching. Our modern Catholic preaching, he maintains, shows more than one sign of feebleness and inefficiency. Its restoration and elevation must come directly from personal labor and meditation on the text of Scripture, from toilsome mastery of its depths, acquired through prayer and self-surrender to the action of the Holy Spirit. "*Nec sumptus consumitur*" may well be said of that banquet of heart and mind which lies spread before us in the New Testament. Very particularly can it be said of the Sunday Gospels and Epistles: "*Habet Scriptura Sacra haustus primos, habet secundos, habet tertios.*"

With the purpose of showing by example the value of the homiletic teaching, Dr. Keppler has selected the Advent Gospels and Epistles, set them in their true *assiette* amid the words and actions of the glorious liturgy of that season, brought to bear on every inspired phrase the best force of old and new exegesis, with exclusion of the merely scientific, and accompanied each "Gospel" and "Epistle" with "*Dispositionen*" or hints and directions to the ecclesiastical reader, whereby he may work over again and again the inexhaustible mine of spiritual knowledge, guidance, and comfort that lies beneath the pages of God's Holy Word. We recommend to all this book, in which will be found the well-digested erudition of a scriptural scholar, the clear, succinct, orderly exposition of one accustomed to the teaching office, and a certain direct, robust eloquence born of long and loving study, of firm grasp of the Gospel truth, and personal surrender to its transforming influences.

2. As a "Festgabe" on the occasion of the fifth centenary of the German National Hospice at Rome, known as the "Anima," founded in 1399, Dr. Faulhaber offers a critical description of the Roman manuscripts that contain what is known as "*Catenæ Patrum.*" These "*Catenæ*" are series of excerpts from the scriptural commentaries of earlier ecclesiastical writers. With the disappearance of the great original theologians, investigators, and commentators of the fourth and fifth centuries there arose an encyclopædic or compilatory movement that marks a grave decline in Christian literature. Boethius, Bede, Isidore of Seville, the compiler of the *Historia Tripartita*, stand as representatives of this temper and tendency in philosophy, general culture, and in church history. In scriptural exegesis the compilers of patristic excerpts, or

"Catenæ," belong to the same school of epigones. If we had the original commentaries of the great Christian exegetes, we would care little for these fragments; unhappily, as Dr. Faulhaber remarks, fully one-half of the exegetical writings of the Fathers have reached us by way of these "Catenæ," and in no otherwise. They are, therefore, material of the first importance, especially when it is a question of a new edition of the Greek Fathers. Cardinal Mai published from the Vatican Archives several folio volumes of such "Catenæ." Migne republished, without critical "curæ," such texts of Mai and of other earlier editors as suited his purpose. Cardinal Pitra, in turn, gathered new fragments of Ante-Nicene commentaries from the old "Catenæ." In spite of these considerable labors, old and new, much remains to be done for the cataloguing and classification of the original sources and for the filiation of the manuscripts. So, too, the character of the various types of these collections, the manuscripts used by the original editors, and the professional treatment the latter gave to their materials, need yet much elucidation.

Dr. Faulhaber has undertaken the scientific description and analysis of those "Catenæ" on the Prophets which are known to exist at Rome. In a preliminary chapter he describes the three Roman MSS. which contain "Catenæ" to all sixteen of the Prophets. In six other chapters he treats of the "Catenæ" to the Minor Prophets, to Isaias, Jeremias, Baruch and the Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the authorship of the "Catenæ" to the Greater Prophets. In each chapter the condition and history of the MSS. treated are made known, inclusive of first editions, when such have been made. A brief literary analysis of their contents follows, and the critical questions of time of origin, compilation, authorship and the like are touched on. In this interesting *Iter Romanum* the author reminds us of valuable unedited material like the commentary of Hesychius on the Minor Prophets. Of the "Catena" which contains it, he concludes that it was written between 450 and 550, is at least contemporary with Procopius of Gaza, hitherto looked on as the oldest of "Catena" compilers; is itself, perhaps, the first of the "Catenæ" that were compiled. In conclusion, the author maintains that most of the "Catena" MSS. examined by him at Rome, in the Vatican, Angelica, Casanatensis, Barberini, and Chigi Archives are largely the work of one man, John of Drungaria, (?) who lived in the seventh or eighth century, and was the intermediary to later times of the original fifth or sixth century compilers of "Catenæ" to the prophets. Dr. Faulhaber's work is a specimen of good historical method, excellent technical training, fine critical sense, and scholarly modesty. He must henceforth receive honorable mention as often as any writer enters on what Pitra calls the "*Catenarum silva periculis et probris diffamata*."

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

St. John Damascene on Images. By Mary H. Allies. London Thomas Baker. 1899. 1 vol., dmo., pp. 211.

St. John Damascene was an encyclopedic genius who lived in the heart of the patristic winter when as yet the second spring—Scholasticism—had put forth no immediate signs of its coming. The last great figure of the Fathers in the East, his life-work lay, according to the spirit of the age, in the accumulation of the wisdom of his forbears, Pagan as well as Christian, and in the working over of the materials of this truly great ancient culture. He had the merit of knowing how to hammer out a precise terminology, of fixing the exact sense of words loosely employed until his time, and of putting order into the chaotic data that lay before him by means of the logic of Aristotle and Porphyry, which shines out through the entire body of his writings. Unfortunately, he is a victim of the law of scientific classification. Critics label him an encyclopedist, an idle repeater of what was said before him, and thus place him in a charmed circle into which the modern investigator is loth to enter, unconsciously disposed as he is beforehand to look upon the work of the Damascene as wrought out in a barren field.

We are glad to see this essay of the Damascene, done so creditably into the English tongue from the original Greek. The controversy on the veneration of images—in the eighth as well as in the nineteenth centuries a matter of such gross misunderstanding and almost hereditary misinformation—is summarily exposed by St. John with a clearness and a cogency that make it yet a work of actual value and interest to those especially in whose minds the ideas of Leo the Isaurian still find a lasting lodgment.

In this work St. John searches the Scriptures and discerns carefully between the worship of *latreia*, paid to God, and the veneration of *doulia*, paid to His saints and servants. The prophets, he says, worshipped angels and men and kings, even a staff. Next in order, he gathers from the Greek Fathers abundant evidence of the fact that "he who swears by an image swears by him whom it represents."

We are not, like the Israelites, prone to idolatry, and we need no Moses to warn us of a habit we are in no danger of acquiring. There is no more idolatry in a Catholic's respect for holy things nor in his veneration of the instruments of Christ's passion or of the images of the saints than there is in the soldier's devotion to his country's flag. *Verba movent, sed exempla trahunt.* Sense paints in color the colorless ideas of the intellect. Yet we are far from neglecting to take into proper account the faulty medium through which perforce we are compelled to see in order to see vividly. Intellect is a corrective. As La Fontaine says: "Quand

l'eau courbe un bâton, ma raison le redresse." Motive, too, is a purifier; and means are always means, not ends. Catholics do not make *idols* to adore, but *ideals* to look up to and to follow. They place before the eye of sense what they wish the eye of intellect to see in all its spiritual significance. *Ignoti nulla cupido.*

The translation is clear and forceful, and there is a good topical index. The sermon on the Assumption, which is appended, is a very happy concrete illustration of the doctrine which the Damascene is theoretically expounding. We recommend this little volume to priests as matter for a good instruction to their flock, while to those who persist in seeing in Catholic practice and devotion nothing short of a recrudescence of forms of worship once proper to the primeval man of the woodland we recommend a reading of this eighth-century reply to their misgivings. Faulty and incomplete though it be in the light of subsequent expositions, it nevertheless bears upon its face the stamp of controversial warmth, and will enlighten, even should it fail to bring conviction.

Thomae Edesseni Tractatus de Nativitate Domini Nostri Christi; textum Syriacum edidit, notis illustravit, Latine reddidit Simon Joseph Carr, S. T. B. A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Philosophy of the Catholic University of America for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Romae, 1898.

This is the first dissertation presented to the Faculty of Philosophy in this University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Aside, however, from this fact, which is of merely local interest, Dr. Carr has made a real contribution to our knowledge of an important period of Syriac literature, and of a very valuable work written during that period; for this is the first time that an original document written by a Nestorian who lived in the golden age of Nestorian Syriac literature has been published. Although the Nestorian heresy had been condemned in the third general council held in Ephesus in the year 431, yet the advocates of the doctrine of Nestorius were by no means silenced. Many of the most learned men of the Persian school of Edessa were among those advocates, and through them the heresy spread over the greater part of Syria. Their activity and influence were so great that Bishop Rabulas closed their school and had the teachers expelled from Syria; but a few years later, one of their own members having been elected Bishop, they were recalled and began again to promulgate their doctrines. Among the works which they circulated were Syriac versions of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus. In 489, however, the emperor Zeno destroyed their school and exiled the teachers. The banished teachers and pupils then established themselves in Persia. There

a new life seemed to have been infused into them. They became a thoroughly organized body, and took on the character of an independent church. The archbishop of Seleucia became the head of this church and assumed the title of "Catholicus." From the Nestorian Arabic documents it is clear that in a comparatively short time the Nestorians obtained possession of nearly all the Persian sees. As the power of the Nestorians increased, so also did their literary activity. Schools were established that soon rivaled the great school of Edessa. Theology occupied the most prominent position; but other sciences also were taught. Instruction in medicine was given, theoretically and practically. Many privileges were granted the students; and the professors had the right of voting at the Synods and in the election of Patriarchs.

From the catalogue of Ebed Jesu it may be inferred that many Nestorian Syrian writers flourished during this period of Nestorian history. But of the writers whom Ebed Jesu ascribes to the sixth century hardly any productions are now extant. Only the canons of the councils and some liturgical works have been preserved. Especially is it to be regretted that nothing as yet has been discovered of the numerous writings of the central figure of Nestorianism during this century, Mar-Abha I, who was Catholicus from 536-552. In his early years he had been a celebrated teacher both in Nisibis and Seleucia, and by his remarkable talents exercised a great influence upon all those with whom he came in contact. Among his works are mentioned a Syriac version of the Scriptures and a translation of the Liturgy of Nestorius. In matters of church discipline he was very strict. The first bishops were men of lax morals and introduced customs that would have tended to the rapid ruin of the Church. Mar-Abha reformed many of the prevailing abuses, and infused a new and vigorous spirit into the entire organization.

Although we have no work by the master, yet we have now in the text edited by Dr. Carr a work of one of his pupils. Very little is known of the life of this pupil, Thomas of Edessa. He became thoroughly imbued with the doctrines of Mar-Abha, and indeed declares that his treatise is nothing more than a written reproduction of the teachings of his master. It is said that Mar-Abha was taught the Greek language by a Thomas of Edessa, who accompanied him to Alexandria and Constantinople, where he died; but it may be inferred from the tone of the first chapter and from the testimony of Cosmos Indicopleustes that the author of the text edited by Dr. Carr was another Thomas, who outlived Mar-Abha. Besides this treatise, Thomas also wrote, according to the catalogue of Ebed Jesu, on the Epiphany, "*epistolam adversus Tonos; solutionem Astrologiae; prolixas sermones Paraceticos; et disputationes adversus haereses.*"

The work edited by Dr. Carr is in reality an exposition of Nestorian theology. The rise and spread of Nestorianism are among the most

interesting subjects of ecclesiastical history. Nestorius, the founder of the heresy (that is, in a public manner, for the views he propounded seem to have been held privately before his time), was a monk educated in the schools of Antioch and deeply imbued with their methods and teachings. In 428 he was elected patriarch of Constantinople. He entered upon the duties of his office filled with a zeal that very soon manifested itself as unregulated by prudence. All who did not agree with him and with the tenets of the Antiochian school were mercilessly persecuted. In the church of Constantinople also he found many phrases in use that to his manner of thinking were wrong and even heretical; in an especial manner did he object to the title *Θεότοκος* as applied to the Virgin Mary. For a time his views were put forward by a few of his intimate friends and disciples; at length, having been drawn into the controversy caused by them, he began publicly to preach his doctrines. According to his doctrine, there were in Christ two natures, divine and human, united in the most intimate manner. There was, however, only one dignity, *μὴν διὰ*, because the human nature was overshadowed by the divine. Hence there was only one Christ, one Son of God. Mary was the mother of the human nature of Christ; she brought forth the man; but she was not and should not be called the mother of God. A schism immediately became imminent; the church was divided, and Nestorius endeavored to silence those who opposed him by forbidding them to preach and by removing them from office. The controversy now became serious, and many openly denounced Nestorius as a heretic. In the meantime the views of Nestorius were scattered about in the East, and at last came to the notice of Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. At first Cyril endeavored to persuade the Bishop of Constantinople that his doctrines were at variance with the received dogma of the Catholic Church; but Nestorius having declined to be persuaded, the whole controversy was at last submitted to Coelestine, Bishop of Rome. Rome, of course, upheld the Catholic doctrine, and the third general council held in Ephesus made it formally an article of Catholic faith.

It is this Nestorian doctrine, then, that Thomas of Edessa expounds. The work is divided into eleven chapters, in which, in a very methodical manner, the nativity of Christ and the various subjects cognate to it are treated. The writer is evidently thoroughly convinced of the truth of his doctrine, and in consequence seems to be so desirous of explaining it and of putting it in such a way that it will be acceptable to other minds that he hardly concerns himself with the refutation of the contrary dogma. This is plain, moreover, not only from the exact manner in which ideas are expressed, but also from the way in which difficulties and objections are anticipated. For instance, after explaining the reasons for the final revelations of God having been made through a man like to

other men, and having brought out clearly the distinction between the divine and the human natures in Christ, and that it was Christ in his human nature who suffered and died for the sins of men, the writer goes on to anticipate the objection that therefore, since Christ in his human nature was a mere man, he alone was able to redeem men. The answer to the objection is given by an exposition of the Nestorian theory of the unity in dignity of Christ, and that therefore he must not be considered as a mere man. The treatise contains many allusions to subjects of an historical character and to peculiarly Nestorian customs. Of very great interest is the account given in the fifth chapter of the method made use of in the teaching of children. This is probably the earliest Syriac narrative on this subject. From it an inference may be drawn of the general state of education and culture among the Nestorian Syrians of the sixth century. This entire treatise, indeed, implies a high degree of intellectual development, not only on the part of the writer, but also on the part of the readers for whom it was written. The influences of Greek thought, language, and literature may easily be traced in most Syriac literature. It was found more convenient to express ideas of an abstract character in Greek words. In later Syriac literature even the arrangement of Greek sentences was followed; much use was made of Greek particles as connectives; but this treatise is written in the purest Syriac. Greek words are almost entirely absent. The sentences are concise and elegant. From a grammatical point of sight it will be of much use in illustrating Syriac syntax. The treatise also contains many new words, and old words are enriched with new meanings.

A valuable addition to our material for the study of the text of the Bible is contained in the Scriptural quotations scattered up and down the pages of the treatise. These will be of especial importance in the study of the Syriac Versions. A comparative study of these quotations and of the corresponding verses in the extant Versions would be of great interest and importance, for while conjectural emendations of the Biblical texts do lead to some good results, yet we are convinced that when a comparative study has been made of all the extant Versions many obscure passages in the Bible will be made clear; there will be less need for conjecture and a higher degree of certitude will be obtained. Dr. Carr must be highly commended for the manner in which he has edited the Syriac text. His work shows that he has thorough command of the language, and has the power, so necessary for an editor of an Oriental text, of entering into the mind of his author and of manifesting the spirit that permeates his work. The textual emendations are good. When it is remembered that there is no contemporary literature to be made use of as a standard for these emendations, and that the editor could only be guided by the genius of the language and the spirit of his author, very great

praise must be given him. It is to be regretted that he did not discuss some of those emendations, and also that he did not give the scriptural references to the quotations in the Syriac text. The translation is good. Dr. Carr has evidently aimed more at accuracy than at elegance of diction. He probably selected the Latin language in order to bring out better the peculiarities of the Syriac text, yet we think the English language could well have been used. The scientific reader will understand that any attempt at Elegant Latinity would affect the scope of the dissertation,—the exact reproduction of the mind of this Nestorian scholar. The Introduction is brief, but contains all the information to be had about the author of the treatise. The discussion of the theological opinions of Thomas of Edessa is deferred until the treatise on the Epiphany contained in the MS. made use of by Dr. Carr has been published. We may then expect a more lengthy examination of the relation of the author of the treatise to the Thomas who died in Constantinople.

Christus und Buddha in ihrem himmlischen Vorleben, von
W. Ph. Englert. Vienna: Mayer & Co., 1898. 124 pp.

It is but a few years since the "Biblische Studien" began to be offered to the scientific world under the able direction of Professor Bardenhewer of Munich. Without exception, they proved to be valuable contributions to Catholic theological science and won universal admiration. Inspired by their success, the Leo Society of Vienna has inaugurated a series of similar studies under the title "Apologetische Studien." They are not to be limited to the field of apologetics proper, but are to be drawn from all branches of ecclesiastical science. Like the "Biblische Studien," they are to be concisely handled by scholars of recognized ability.

The honor of producing the first of these apologetic studies belongs to Dr. Englert, professor of Apologetics in the University of Bonn. Alive to the growing importance of the science of comparative religion, and recognizing the efforts now being made in Germany to cultivate an interest in Buddhism to the detriment of Christianity, Dr. Englert has set himself the task of making a critical comparison between Christ and Buddha, and of establishing the immeasurable superiority of the Saviour of mankind over the Indian reformer.

In this comparison the author does not attempt to cover the whole ground of inquiry, but limits himself to what he considers, with doubtful propriety, to be the most significant part, namely, the character of Christ's and of Buddha's heavenly existence preceding their appearance on earth as founders of religions. In addition to this, he contrasts what is recorded of Christ's birth and infancy with the legends touching the beginning of Buddha's earthly career.

As is well known, the legendary account of the founder of Buddhism offers certain striking, but imperfect, analogies with the inspired records of the life of our blessed Lord and Saviour. By the merits of his many previous existences Buddha is said to have raised himself to the dignity of a god, destined to be reborn as the perfect, enlightened man, who was to point out to his fellow-beings the true way to everlasting peace. It was while enjoying this divine existence in heaven that he chose the time and place of his appearance on earth and the parentage that was to be honored by his birth. He was miraculously conceived in his mother, *Maya*, who alone of women was fit to bear him on account of her transcendent virtues. Buddha's birth was likewise an object of wonder. It was while on a journey that his mother was painlessly delivered, and the event was accompanied by the most striking prodigies in heaven and on earth. Too sacred to bear other children, his mother died seven days afterward. Meanwhile the wonderful infant, already possessing the use of reason, was presented to the venerable ascetic *Devala*, who recognized in him the signs of the future Buddha and foretold his greatness.

These are the features of Buddha's life that Dr. Englert contrasts with what the inspired gospels tell of our blessed Saviour. He dwells on the supernatural character of the latter, and points out the purely human origin of the Buddhist legends. While not of an equally high order of merit with the "*Biblische Studien*," this apologetic study will be read with interest by the generality of theologians.

CHURCH HISTORY.

Saint Ambroise, par le Duc de Broglie. Paris: V. Lecoffre. 1899, 8°, pp. 202.

Saint Basile, par Paul Allard. Ibid., 8°, pp. 208.

Sainte Mathilde, par L. Eugène Hallberg. Ibid., 8°, pp. 176.

Saint Henri, par l'abbé Henri Lesêtre. Ibid., 8°, pp. 213.

Saint Dominique, par Jean Guiraud. Ibid., 8°, pp. 211.

The volumes of the Lecoffre collection of "*Les Saints*" follow one another with exemplary rapidity. More than once we have called the attention of our readers to their specific value—succinctness of exposition and accuracy of outline, use of latest critical editions of original authorities as well as the latest researches made by their light, moderation of tone, and insistence on those points of hagiography which appeal to the modern conscience. The commodious and portable volumes are entrusted to authors of acquired fame. The names of M. Allard and the Duc de Broglie need no recommendation when it is a question of literary

ripeness and conscientious scientific work. Occasionally a serviceable introduction, like that of M. Hallberg to the Life of Sainte Mathilde, offers the reader judicious conclusions concerning the times and circumstances of the saint. In the lives of the Eastern Basil and the Western Ambrose we have vigorous men of action, fearless and aggressive, men who appreciated old and new learning, and wielded the pen with such efficacy that their words yet echo in the world. In Mecthilde and Henry we have other types of action, great rulers of Teutonic blood, who conquer themselves for Christ's sake, and quench by mortification and humility those terrible racial ardors which else had flamed forth in Berserker rages or Viking atrocities. The Mecthildes, Henrys, Cune-gondes, Elizabeths, lived for the good of mankind. There is something new and forceful in the sight of these nobles of dominant feudalism who quit of their own free will the places of power to follow in the footsteps of the meek and mild Christ.

If Germany was filled in the Middle Ages with Quedlinburgs and Bambergs, it was because the men and women of the land could never forget the example of self-renouncement given to them so often by their rulers, and especially, to their honor be it said, by the exalted females whose roll-call begins at Poitiers with Radegundis, to close, be it hoped, in Paradise. They were the philosophers needed by a rude and imperfect time; they were the ethical models indispensable to nations in whose hearts and minds there smoldered yet the fires of ancient ethnicism; they were the exponents of public office as a duty, a responsibility before God, and not a chattel of the ruler. It is well to seek the roots and germs of our modern constitutions in the various sections of the old Germanic world, but there is one line of research that cannot be forgotten, and that is the initiative and transforming power of *personality*, none the less remarkable when it takes the shape of superior moral worth or sanctity. So one must forever turn over the pages of the Bollandists, as well as those of the Grimms and the Giesebrechts, if one would know how the mediæval world was made, and how so much of it lives yet and energizes in the nineteenth century, thinly veiled under the technology of a scientific jargon, like the hideous classical restorations of some fine Gothic church.

In Dominic we have another type of action, no longer of the fourth or tenth century, but of the wonderful Trecento—mediæval, Spaniard, mystic, prayerful, ardent, the Cid of Catholicism. The period is one of free popular association; the communes take consciousness of themselves on all sides; the new cities rise, freed from the ancient control of feudal bishop or noble; the old monastic orders, grown wealthy and aristocratic have lost their original hold on the popular heart; restless Arabic and

Moorish influences are at work, easily discernible to the Spaniard, on whose soil they pullulate; the remnants of Manichæism and Paulicianism awake, crossed by lines of social discontent and ancient pagan culturism in Southern France; the renaissance of Judaism, hopeful, rationalistic, worldly, and the loosening of new cosmopolitan forces by the numerous and unsuccessful crusades, are other signs by which Dominic knows that a new epoch has dawned. This son of the Guzmans, in whose blood flows a double strain, Roman and Gothic, in whose mind slumber old memories of the empire, of Arianism hated and crushed, of Græco-Arabism shunned and detested, of Moorish domination held at bay by individual proud mountaineers, taught the world something new. Francis brought back the dying apostolic spirit in the guise of the sanctity of poverty; Dominic did the same, but in the guise of the sanctity of teaching. Francis is the perfect and centennial flower of the highest mysticism, the paladin of ideal Catholicism, as foreign to all that is dubious and mixed as is the air of his own lofty Alvernia. Dominic, too, was a mystic soul, striving idealward; but he was no child of lovely Umbria, with its softly contoured hills, its sweet and delicate atmosphere, its fairy landscapes, its perfect and reposeful nature. Dominic came from a mountain land; from a family of nobles, feudal, warlike, alert; the passion, sole dominant, of Catholic unity held him fast, and nourished itself by every page of the history of Spain, from the Roman persecutions to the tyranny of Moorish masters.

What was wanted in such a world, if Catholicism was to withstand the many and seductive forces of the Orient,—Hellenism, Arabism, Manichæism, Byzantinism,—was popular instruction. What Saint Ignatius foresaw in the sixteenth century, what was equally well seen by Saint Philip Neri and Saint Charles Borromeo—the need of solid instruction in the nature and principles of Catholic Christianity—was no less clear in his time to the founder of the Order of Preachers. As to the conduct of Saint Dominic in the Albigensian crusade, it is well to remember that the Albigenses were a real menace to society, with their subversive teachings concerning the world, life, and marriage; they were the theoretical anarchists of the time. Douais and Brutails have shown the anti-social character of their teachings. Doubtless we would not repress them today as they were repressed by Simon de Montfort and Saint Dominic, but the men of the thirteenth century had penal codes of a very cruel character; indeed, it was owing to the ecclesiastical procedure that any betterments were introduced. It is not so long since a European ruler expressed to his army his conviction that in case of necessity they would, at his order, fire upon their own parents and brothers.

A Benedictine Martyr in England: Being the life and times of the venerable servant of God, Dom John Roberts, O. S. B., by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B., B. A. London: Bliss, Sands & Co., 1897, pp. 316.

The gems of modern hagiological literature are, unhappily, all too few to let this little work go by without a tardy tribute in our pages. Whoever reads this story of the martyr, John Roberts (1575-1610), executed under James I. at Tyburn, in the flower of his age, for the crime of being a priest, will scarcely refrain from tears, so honest and artless is the style of the narrator, so steadily does he let the original materials tell their own tale in their own quaint but vigorous and emotional speech. John Roberts was a young Oxford student, converted during a year of travel on the continent, though his family seem to have been Catholics at heart like so many others in the time of Elizabeth and Shakespeare. After a short stay in the Jesuit Seminary for young Englishmen, at Valladolid, he joined the Benedictines, impelled by the conviction that the original apostles of England must again win it back to the Catholic faith. His Welsh ardor and strong personality led many English youths to join the Benedictines, the result of which was the establishment of St. Gregory's Priory, at Douai, from which the Benedictines of Downside have sprung; another result was the painful controversy between the Jesuits and the Benedictines arising from the return of the latter to the English mission, a controversy which embittered still more the Archpriest disputes, and left the saddest memories in the minds of the ecclesiastics of the seventeenth century. Many documents of it are given by Dom Camm with much charity and impartiality. The scene of Dom Roberts' death recalls the simplicity and grandeur of the martyrdom of Polycarp; the material ought to be worked up in some great romance, so near and tragic and varied are the sentiments that it arouses, so little is wanting of the elements that lend spice and charm to the pages of Ruinart.

Le Cardinal Meignan (1817-1896), par l'Abbé Henri Boissonnot, son secrétaire intime. Paris: V. Lecoffre. 1899, 8°, pp. 556.

Certainly the life of the late Archbishop of Tours offers an instructive glimpse into the history of the Church of France during the nineteenth century. The reader who is aware of the currents of thought and feeling, the controversies and discussions, which have marked the ecclesiasticism of nineteenth century France will find in these pages some novel documents and viewpoints. The reader who enters upon this stormy history for the first time will make, at the outset, the acquaintance of one of the most charming and pacific as well as the most learned and active of the French episcopate. Guillaume René Meignan, born

in the Craonnais, where Maine, Anjou, and Brittany meet, successively priest, professor at the Sorbonne, vicar at Paris, bishop of Châlons, then of Arras, and finally Archbishop of Tours, was one of the most high-minded, liberal, and efficient men who have illustrated the French Church in modern times. Through the advice of Montalembert and Ozanam he spent a considerable time in study at the German universities of Munich and Berlin, where he came into close personal contact with such Catholic savants as Goerres, Haneberg, Doellinger, Phillips, von Moy, Klee, Windischmann, and others. At home his talent and amiability won for him the esteem and friendship of the influential clergy of France, such as Maret, Dupanloup, Falloux, and Gerbet. Throughout his early life he seems to have moved in the circles best qualified to lend him grace of manner and distinction, as well as taste, judgment, love of learning, and a certain fine and rare moderation of mind.

Out of personal observation and abundant documents in the shape of memoirs and correspondence, his biographer has succeeded in weaving a fascinating description of this busy episcopal life. The daily labor of the scholar, the hours of diocesan administration, the painful conflicts that cannot always be avoided with justice and dignity by men in power, the grave cares of a politico-ecclesiastical character, the constant exercise of the episcopal virtues, are here put forth with affection and frankness. The book is really absorbing. It shows to any reflective, sympathetic mind what a Procrustean bed a French see may be made, and how supremely essential to the care of souls is the liberty of the chief pastor. Though he did not escape criticism, at times tipped with acerbity, Cardinal Meignan retained to the end the confidence of the government and of the Holy See, as well as of his own clergy and people. Somewhat Fabian in his public policy, he believed that the chief remedy of the modern situation was the instruction of the clergy. Averse to their activity in politics, timid and distrustful of modern journalism, he was in this century one of the chief promoters of higher ecclesiastical studies. Devoted to the progress and elevation of his diocesan clergy, he was a pillar of the movement that resulted in the present *Instituts Catholiques* of France, though he would have preferred a single central school, where all energies might be gathered for a common effort. Originally very sympathetic to the Republic of 1848, he lived in a dignified peace with the Second Empire as Bishop of Châlons, gaining gradually in esteem, until dark days dawned for France in 1870. Patriotic and devoted in the war and the years of reconstruction, republican at heart and on principle, he was among the foremost supporters of the policy of Cardinal Lavergne and Leo XIII. with regard to the Third Republic,—the policy of frank adhesion and support. To the unjust and impolitic attitude of the government he opposed a policy of patience and apostolic activity within

the circle of the priestly calling. He was always confident that a learned and apostolic clergy would one day bring back France from her official irreligion. Clamorous and vindictive conduct he seems to have especially deprecated, likewise a certain militant fierceness among Catholics. *Non in commotione Dominus.* Longanimity, magnanimity, the love of all science, a public sympathy with the good ideals and endeavors of the community, a horror of the violent and the extreme,—in a word, the best historic traits of the episcopate of the “vieux régime,”—were found in him. Himself apologist by profession, he recalls the cultured and conciliatory Melito of Sardes, not the rugged and declamatory Tertullian, the cautious Cyprian and not the ardent Hippolytus. It is perhaps not strange that in an age and a land where Christianity is being publicly bled to death many should rush upon the idols and seek death in the overthrow of supreme abominations. Yet the leaders of the flock need then, more than ever, a strong grasp on the “common sense” of religion, a deep reposeful faith in the power and veracity of Jesus Christ, a sacred luminous hope in the healing transforming power of time, and the courage to yield up the baton of command neither to those who urge a final retreat nor to those who would storm Gibraltar itself.

In the world of letters Cardinal Meignan will be long and favorably known by his masterpiece in seven volumes, “*L'Ancien Testament dans ses rapports avec le Nouveau et la Critique Moderne.*”¹

Originally inclined to the study of philosophy, it was in Germany that the future cardinal caught from Hengstenberg the inspiration of the prophetic preparation of Christ's Kingdom. Renan, too, had brought inspiration from “*Outre-Rhin,*” and soon filled France with the fatal sweetness of his style and the soft caressing accents of his tinsel mysticism. Meignan, already favorably known by his apologetic work, “*Le monde et l'homme primitif,*” took up at once the defence of the Scripture against the author of “*L'Histoire du Peuple d'Israel,*” and to his death remained the protagonist among French Catholic writers in this department.

¹ The titles of the separate volumes are as follows: I. *De l'Eden à Moïse, avec des considérations sur l'autorité du Pentateuque.* II. *De Moïse à David, avec une introduction sur les types ou figures de la Bible.* III. *David Roi, psalmiste, prophète, avec une introduction sur la Nouvelle Critique.* IV. *Solomon, son règne, ses écrits.* V. *Les Prophètes d'Israel, Quatre siècles de lutte contre l'idolatrie.* VI. *Les Prophètes d'Israel et le Messie, depuis Solomon jusqu'à Daniel.* VII. *Les Derniers Prophètes d'Israel.* All are published by Lecoffre, and together form a “library” that every priest and cultured layman might well own and read with profit and pleasure. They follow step by step the aberrations of Renan, and are praised in France for the charm of their style and diction. Moreover, they are the work of a well-formed thinker, a bishop of long and varied experience, sympathetic to all that is good and tenable in his adversary's labors, and disposed to reject no real advance in the content or the methods of philology, history, archæology, ethnology, or the natural sciences.

These volumes represent the thought and research of many years, guided by approved method and principles of study and application. They are not merely the elucubrations of a scholar; they contain the outpourings of a truly episcopal heart; they are "homilies" for the new times,—the exposition of the author's views is never quite free from this preoccupation with the spiritual interest of the reader. The Church of France, without a university for its clerics or endowments for higher study or rewards for the devoted and laborious, rejoiced to see the brilliant defense and apology set up by the young "vicaire" of Ste. Clotilde. His work, completed in seven volumes, remains yet the principal French authority on the prophecies and an excellent basis for the serious study of the history of Catholicism.

Cardinal Meignan was also the author of a clever work entitled "*Un prêtre déporté*," the history of a relative cruelly martyred on the foreign missions during the Revolution. We have also from his pen an admirable work on the duties of parents.¹

The protégé and admirer of Cardinal Lavigerie, Meignan belonged to that great man's school. More than once the names of Manning and Gibbons recur in his biography with approval and sympathy. He sighed for the adoption by France of the "large and generous religious liberty of the United States." To a friend he wrote (February 3, 1893):

"You know my personal sentiments. I desire for France such a liberty as the Church has in the United States. Thus we would escape from the tutelage of the government. Still I recognize that this condition of affairs is impossible in France. It has taken a long time and peculiar circumstances to establish it in America. It would take longer to make it a reality with us. Nevertheless, with all due respect to the public power and submission to the laws, there is nothing to prevent us drawing inspiration from the great examples of the Mannings and the Gibbons, from seeking with ardor the welfare of the people, notably the workingmen and the unfortunate. The Republic has nothing to hope from a clergy become servile, and therefore contemptible."

It may not be amiss to add to the foregoing lines the translation of certain paragraphs destined to appear in a work entitled "*Le Nouveau Testament dans ses rapports avec l'Ancien, et la Critique Moderne*." They are a true rule of faith, and on the lips of so valiant a leader recall the spirit of Athanasius:

"I believe in a Divine Providence, in Jesus, my Master, who was wont to say, I am the Resurrection and the Life. I love Jesus, I love the Virgin Mary, divine types of sweetness and purity. * * * Without God I do not comprehend either the physical or the moral order. With

¹ *Instructions et conseils sur le mariage, les enfants, la famille.* Paris: Téqui, 1875.

God in the heart of both I understand them. This is the great proof of the existence of God, the one which has always compelled my adhesion, in youth, in mature manhood, and in my old age. I adore God, Creator and Governor of the world, all-powerful, all-knowing. I adore Him in three persons—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If revelation did not make known to me the mystery of the Trinity, I would have reached it like Schilling—through the concepts of power, thought, and love. Providence follows from my idea of God. The latter is action, pure, unceasing. He is substance, but also action eternal, necessary, intelligent, free. That action is felt in creation. It is also shown forth in history by the life of the Jewish people, by the preparation and fulfillment of the Redemption, by the history of Israel and the Church. The fact of the divine mission of Jesus Christ, the Word made Flesh, come down to earth, and restoring mankind to the abandoned path of goodness, is the basis of my hopes—the faith which has upheld, guided, and enlightened me through life. The Catholic Church is the only historic, authentic, traditional form in which has been realized the society founded by Jesus Christ in order to preserve and set in motion His revelation and His religion.”

PHILOSOPHY.

Criteriologie Générale ou Théorie Générale de la Certitude.

Par D. Mercier. Louvain. 1899. Pp. xvii + 371.

Since 1897 Monsignor Mercier has been busily engaged in preparing for the press a course of Philosophy. Volumes on Logic, Ontology, and Psychology have already been published and this is the fourth volume in the series. The publications of the distinguished head of the Institut supérieur de philosophie at Louvain have been well received in critical circles, notably his volume on “Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine,” the book notices of which have been very flattering. It is safe to predict that the future volumes of this “Cours de philosophie” will prove as valuable as those already issued, and be of service to the Catholic student of today, beset as he is on all sides with a labyrinth of views and theories into the strength or weakness of which he is compelled perforce to examine.

The author of this volume has wisely chosen as its title that of Criteriology, as the old and commonly received appellation of Material or Real Logic has become very misleading since the days of Kant. It is better to adopt a new title than to employ an old one, which, though excellent in itself, has grown to be associated with Kant's empty *a priori* forms as contrasted with the content of experience, and would therefore

serve to perpetuate a usage that is open on all sides to much hostile criticism.

The first division of the author is concerned with the state of the question of the general problem of certitude, its psychological origin, the terms which it proposes to define, such as truth, certainty, evidence, and error, together with a portrayal of the faulty conceptions which usually accompany a discussion of this fundamental topic. Everything is clearly and succinctly placed before the reader, and the several states of the human mind above enumerated are critically considered, with all the more interest that the author has given his treatment a distinctively modern setting.

In the second division the discussion falls on universal doubt, real and methodical, and on exaggerated philosophical dogmatism, to the historical and doctrinal exposition of which the author has added several chapters of critical refutation. Neither the affirmation of the existence of a thinking subject nor of the natural aptitude of the human mind to know the truth constitutes, according to the author, the primitive, irrefragable basis of all certainty. To transfer the problem of epistemology from the domain of *reflexion*, where it properly belongs and where alone its myriad difficulties exist, to the domain of *spontaneity* or of instinctive belief, where certitude is had for the asking, is to torment one's self with an unsolvable enigma. Once we set over in marked contrast each against the other the respective spheres of spontaneity and reflexion, such is the abyss between the two that but one conclusion, desperate indeed, remains to be drawn. It is that this human machine of ours has been poorly put together. But why thus raise a false issue at the outset? Why create difficulties of our own making, and thus cheat ourselves in an effort to solve what by the very nature of the case is shut to all solution? The question between the real skeptics and the dogmatists is not to know if we have certain spontaneous and irresistible judgments, but to know whether we can justify our spontaneous judgments by reflexive and scientific certainty. Hence a reasonable dogmatism, a critical realism, is the proper attitude to be assumed towards the questions which epistemology raises. On the threshold of epistemology the critic should abstain from prejudging the issue, either by assuming the fitness or unfitness of our cognitive faculties for attaining unto certainty. He should maintain a *feigned* ignorance. He should for the time being assume nothing, but pick his way carefully to certainty through demonstration.

How this is accomplished, the author proceeds to show in the third division. After examining into the various theories explanatory of the real ground of certitude, he lays bare the insufficiency of Traditionalism, Transcendentalism, and Positivism, establishes the objectivity of ideas,

and finally closes with the respective definitions of truth and certainty, which formed the purpose of the treatise.

We take pleasure in recommending this entire "*Cours de philosophie*" to professors and students of philosophy. It will repay the most careful perusal. The author is conversant with the modern literature of his subject, and has so framed his treatment that it meets the actual needs of the hour. He makes St. Thomas and the schoolmen speak pertinently on the philosophic themes now in circulation, and to read him attentively is to master the philosophy of the school in its relevancy to modern thought. The style is clear and forcible, and all subtle controversies are judiciously excluded. To a studious mind desirous of knowing what the old philosophy has to say to the new, and anxious to obtain a good "*aperçu général*" of the fundamental attitude of modern philosophy, this fourth volume of the author's course is truly commendable. "*Nova et vetera*" is his motto: the work here reviewed is a good sample of its realization.

CANON LAW.

Urbs et Orbis, or The Pope as Bishop and as Pontiff, by William Humphrey, S. J. London, Thomas Baker. 1899. 8°, pp. 497.

The cleric can easily find in the many excellent modern manuals of canon law all needed information concerning the general administration of the Catholic Church at Rome. Such knowledge has not been easily accessible to laymen, in English, at first hand, from trustworthy writers. The book of Father Humphrey fills this want, as may be seen from the titles of the seven chapters: I, Elements in the Church of Divine Institution; II, Elements in the Church of Human Institution; III, The Senate of the Pope (Cardinals); IV, The Household of the Pope; V, The Diocese of Rome; VI, The Sacred Roman Congregations; VII, The Papal Blessing. Every clergyman knows how frequently he is besieged for direct and authoritative information on the actual management of the Church in general. Henceforth this work may safely be suggested as a competent guide. Although the chapters are indexed at length, there should be added a General Index; otherwise such works of consultation are easily made burdensome in use, and eventually fail to win their merited success. A larger bibliography should have been added, giving the full titles, and the scope at least, of the best modern works on these matters. It is owing to them that Father Humphrey has been enabled to put before the public this useful volume, and a knowledge of their existence might induce many a reader to extend his studies on the marvelous organization of Catholicism.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Between Whiles, a collection of verses by Arthur Barry O'Neill, C. S. C., Chicago; D. H. McBride & Co., 1899.
- Short Catechism of Church History for the Higher Grades of Catholic Schools, by Rev. J. B. Oechtering. St. Louis, Herder, 1899.
- In the Turkish Camp, and Other Stories. Mary R. Gray. St. Louis, Herder, 1899.
- Bettering Ourselves, by Katherine E. Conway. Boston, Pilot Publishing Co., 1899.
- The Irish Washingtons at Home and Abroad, by Thomas Hamilton Murray. Boston, Carrollton Press, 1898.
- Christian Education, or The Duties of Parents. From the German of the Rev. William Becker, S. J., by a priest of the diocese of Cleveland. St. Louis, Herder, 1899, 8°, pp. 424.
- Notes on a History of Auricular Confession: H. C. Lee's Account of the Power of the Keys in the Early Church, by Rev. P. H. Casey, S. J., Professor of Theology in Woodstock College. John Jos. McVey, Philadelphia, 1899, 8°, pp. 118.
- Students' Standard Speller. Potter & Putnam, New York, 1890, 8°, pp. 158.

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7th.

The Tenth Annual Commencement Exercises of the University were held in the Assembly Rooms or Aula Maxima of McMahon Hall, Wednesday, June 7th, at 10 A. M.

His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor of the University, presided. There were present, besides the entire staff of the professors and instructors, many distinguished clergymen and laymen. Of the diplomatic corps we noticed the Ambassador of France, and the Ministers of Japan, Portugal, and Switzerland.

The proceedings were opened by the Right Reverend Rector, who delivered an address on "The Necessity of Religion in Collegiate Education." He prefaced his address by a reference to the prosperity of the University on the completion of its first decade. He characterized the present scholastic year as being one of great fruitfulness, both in the gifts which had been bestowed or promised, as also in the character of the work which had been done. The visit of the foundress of the University, the Marquise de Méroville, at the opening of the year seemed to bring with it promises of successful co-operation, which have been more than realized. The popular demonstrations of interest in the University on the part of the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Knights of America in the founding of the Chair of American History by the one and of English Literature by the other were a manifestation of the deep interest which the people feel in the University. A source of great encouragement was also found in the tribute paid to the memory of a devoted priest on the part of the Catholics of Brooklyn in the establishment of a scholarship to Rev. James H. Mitchell, LL. D. Reference was made to the deaths last year of Mr. Joseph Banigan, of Providence, R. I., and Mrs. Eugene Kelley, of New York, both devoted benefactors of the University.

Then followed the conferring of degrees on the successful candidates, as follows:

Baccalaureate in Science.

Louis Grandin Carmick.

George Vincent Powers.

Baccalaureate in Law.

James Joseph Igoe, A. B. (Mt. St. Mary's), New Castle, Pa.

William Charles Loeffler, A. B. (Holy Ghost College), Pittsburg, Pa.

John Walter Lyons, Brandon, Vt.
 Arthur David Maguire, B. L. (St. Mary's College, Montreal), Hamilton, Ohio.
 Thomas Jeremiah O'Brien, A. B. (Rock Hill), Lynchburg, Va.
 Charles Francis Reidinger, Marquette, Mich.
 Louis Carbery Ritchie, Washington, D. C.
 Francis Winslow Williams, Brandon, Vt.

Master of Laws.

Owen William Reddy, LL. B. (Catholic University), Attorney-at-Law, Newburyport, Mass.
 George Joseph Twohy, A. B. (Rock Hill), LL. B. (Catholic University), Attorney-at-Law, Norfolk, Va.

Doctorate in Law.

Brainerd Avery, LL. B. (Columbian), LL. M. (Catholic University, Attorney-at-Law, Rutland, Vt. Dissertation: "Power of Corporations Organized under the General Law of the District of Columbia, to Acquire and Hold Lands in Other States."
 Theodor Papezoglow Ion, J. C. B. and J. C. L. (Paris), Attorney-at-Law, Washington, D. C. Dissertation: "The Eastern Question."

Doctorate in Civil Law.

William Ansley Edwards, A. B. (Emory), LL. B. and LL. M. (Georgetown). Attorney-at-Law, Covington, Ga. Dissertation: "The Influence of the Roman Law on the Law of England."
 Taizo Okada, Diploma in Law (Tokio University, Japan), LL. B. (Yale), Attorney-at-Law, Tokio, Japan. Dissertation: "The Theories of Individualism and Familism as Affecting the Development of Political Science and Law, with Especial Reference to the Empire of Japan."

Baccalaureate in Theology.

Rev. Peter Joseph Beutgen, Archdiocese of Portland.
 Rev. Roman Butin, S. M.
 John Joseph Burke, C. S. P.
 Charles Dubray, S. M.
 Rev. John Francis Griffin, A. B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) Diocese of Springfield, Mass.
 Frances Xavier Lechner, S. M.
 Rev. Timothy Patrick O'Keefe, Archdiocese of Santa Fe.
 Rev. John Henry O'Neill, Diocese of Ogdensburg.
 Rev. John Augustine Ryan, Archdiocese of St. Paul.
 Rev. John Smyth, Archdiocese of San Francisco.
 Rev. William Lawrence Sullivan, C. S. P., Ph. B.

Licentiate in Theology.

Rev. Victor Francis Ducat, A. B. and A. M. (Detroit College), S. T. B. (Catholic University) Diocese of Detroit. *Magna cum laude*. Dissertation:—"The Suspension Ex Informata Conscientia as it affects Ordained Clerics."

Rev. Stephen Charles Hallissey, A. B. (Holy Cross College), S. T. B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore), Diocese of Springfield, Mass. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation:—"On the Orthodoxy of Eusebius of Caesarea, Father of Church History."

Rev. Patrick Joseph Healy, S. T. B. (Catholic University), Archdiocese of New York. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation:—"An Inquiry into the Sources and History of the Allegorical System of Origen."

Rev. William Joseph Higgins, A. B. (Lasalle), S. T. B. (Catholic University), Archdiocese of Philadelphia. *Magna cum laude*. Dissertation:—"The Canonical Impediment of Legal Cognation."

Rev. Florence Aloysius Lane, A. B. (Manhattan College), S. T. B. (Catholic University), Diocese of Springfield, Mass. *Magna cum laude*. Dissertation:—"St. Cyprian's Concept of the Christian Hierarchy."

Rev. John William McDermott, S. T. B. (Catholic University), Diocese of Syracuse. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation:—"God, Knowable or Unknowable: A Comparative Study of St. Thomas and Herbert Spencer."

Rev. Edmund Augustine O'Connor, S. T. B. (Catholic University), Diocese of Albany. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation: "The Development of Ecclesiastical Procedure in Matrimonial Causes."

Rev. Maurice Joseph O'Connor, Ph. B. (Boston College), S. T. B. (Catholic University) Archdiocese of Boston. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation: "The Ethics of the Press."

Rev. Louis O'Donovan, A. M., and S. T. B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore), Archdiocese of Baltimore. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation: "The Christian Charity of the Fourth Century: A Comparative Study."

Rev. Philip Henry Sheridan, A. B., A. M., and S. T. B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore), Archdiocese of Baltimore. *Magna cum laude*. Dissertation: "An Historical Study of Marcion viewed especially in his relations to Luther."

Rev. John William Sullivan, A. M. and S. T. B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore), Archdiocese of San Francisco. *Maxima cum laude*. Dissertation: "The Concept of the Church as found in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius of Caesarea."

Doctorate in Theology.

Rev. James Joseph Fox, B. A. (Royal University, Ireland), S. T. L.: (Catholic University, 1897). Dissertation: "Religion and Morality; Their Nature and Mutual Relations Historically and Doctrinally Considered," pp. 325.

In all forty-six degrees were conferred. In acknowledgment of the degrees, Mr. George V. Powers, B. S., spoke for the students of the School of Technology, Mr. Louis C. Ritchie, LL. B., for those of the School of Law, and Rev. Dr. James J. Fox for the students of the School of Theology. The exercises were brought to a close by an address from the Cardinal.

At the conclusion of the Cardinal's remarks the professors and distinguished guests repaired to Caldwell Hall, where an elaborate banquet was served.

A DOCTORATE OF THEOLOGY.

One of the most interesting events that has occurred for some years at the University was the examination of Rev. James J. Fox, S. T. L., for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology. The examination lasted for two days, May 31 and June 1, from 9 A. M. to 12 M. It was held in the Aula Maxima of McMahon Hall, and was conducted by the Faculty of Theology, presided over by the Right Rev. Rector. The examination is a most trying ordeal for a candidate, and it was the general opinion of the auditors, as well as of the examiners, that Father Fox made a splendid defense of his theses and book against the objections of the distinguished theologians who were present.

Rev. Father Fox has been a student of the University for the past three years. Two years ago he passed with distinction his examination for the licentiate; since then he has been preparing for the severe test of the doctorate.

The first condition imposed by the University for the doctorate in theology is the composing of an original dissertation, embodying a novel treatment of some important point of ecclesiastical science. This dissertation must be presented in book form to the Faculty of Theology before the student can be admitted to the oral examination.

The dissertation of Dr. Fox was entitled "Religion and Morality: Their Nature and Mutual Relations, Historically and Doctrinally Considered." It covers the same ground as the almost similarly-named work of Rev. James Kidd, entitled "Morality and Religion." It differs, however, from this work in many important points. It goes more deeply into the nature of religion in general and the historical proofs of its existence and character among all peoples. One distinctive feature of the work consists of several preliminary chapters treating of the presence and nature of the religious feeling among all known peoples of antiquity and modern times. The book offers throughout abundant evidences of right historical method, critical feeling, acumen, and solid erudition. There is no doubt but that it will command very wide attention from all who are interested in this phase of thought.

The examinations were conducted alternately in English and Latin. Besides his book, which was licit matter for discussion with each examiner, the candidate presented seventy-five theses drawn from different departments of theological science. From these each examiner chose at hazard, and subjected the candidate to searching and severe questioning.

The proceedings were opened by a brief address from the Right Rev. Rector, Mgr. Conaty. After calling attention to the importance of the examination for the doctorate, he presented Father Fox, whose character and ability were sufficient guarantees of his right to contend for the highest degree in the gift of the University.

The examination was brought to a close by the Right Rev. Rector, who cordially thanked the visiting examiners for their kindness in coming, as many of them did, from a distance to take part in the proceedings. He congratulated Father Fox on his spirited defense, and then introduced the Apostolic Delegate, most Rev. Archbishop Martinelli. His Excellency spoke with much feeling, saying that from the record of these days' proceedings it was clear that the Catholic University was practically fulfilling the high scientific hopes entertained by its founder, Leo XIII. He referred to the dialectic skill and erudition of the defendant and to the self-sacrificing labors of his professors, whose pride and glory he was.

Those who took part in the examination were Very Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, dean; Very Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, D. D., Very Rev. Charles P. Grannan, D. D., Rev. Edmund T. Shanahan, D. D., Rev. John T. Creagh, of the faculty of theology of the University; Right Rev. Mgr. Sbarretti, of the Apostolic Delegation; Rev. John J. Tierney, D. D., professor of Dogmatic Theology at Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Md.; Rev. Timothy B. Barrett, S. J., professor of Moral Theology at Woodstock, Md.; Rev. Dr. Driscoll, S. S., professor of Dogmatic Theology at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y.; Rev. A. A. Tanquery, S. S., D. D., professor of Moral Theology at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore; Rev. Francis J. Sollier, S. M., D. D., professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Marist College, Washington, D. C.; Very Rev. L. J. Kearney, O. P., provincial of the Order of St. Dominic, and Rev. George J. Lucas, D. D., of Blossburg, Pa.

Among those present were Very Rev. M. P. Smith, C. S. P., Very Rev. Edward Tuohy, C. P., superior of St. Joseph's Passionist Monastery, Baltimore; Rev. William J. Doherty, S. J., and Rev. H. Shandelle, S. J., both of Georgetown College; Very Rev. L. F. M. Dumont, S. S., D. D., Rev. H. H. Chapuis, S. S., Rev. George Doherty, of St. Augustine's Church; Rev. J. P. Moran, O. P., pastor of St. Dominic's Church, and Baron Carra de Vaux, professor of Arabic at the Institut Catholique of Paris.

A number of former students of the University assisted at the examination. Among them were Rev. Francis P. Duffy, S. T. B., of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie; Rev. James D. O'Neill, S. T. L., assistant

professor of Moral Theology at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore; Rev. Maurice M. Hassett, S. T. L., rector of the Cathedral, Harrisburg, Pa.; Rev. Jeremiah O'Meara, S. T. L., of Pawtucket, R. I. After the examination the students surrounded Father Fox and bore him off to their quarters amid much enthusiasm. They were profound in their expressions of joy and satisfaction that one of their number had borne himself so becomingly during the long and severe ordeal.

At the conclusion of the examination, on June 1, the Rector gave a banquet at which he entertained Archbishop Martinelli, the Faculty of Theology, the visiting examiners and the new doctor. At the end of the banquet the Dean of the Faculty, Very Rev. Dr. Shahan, at the request of the Rector, introduced Dr. Fox in a few words of praise and welcome. He called attention to the high significance of these days' proceedings, in which monastery, seminary, college and university found themselves united in rewarding long and earnest scientific labors. Referring to the teachers of Dr. Fox, he called special attention to the labor and merit of Very Rev. Dr. Bouquillon, under whose direction the new doctor had prepared his dissertation and theses.

On Commencement Day, June 7th, Rev. Father Fox, after reading the Profession of Faith in his own name and that of all the candidates for theological degrees, was formally invested by the Chancellor with the insignia of the doctorate, the mantle and hood, the ring and the cap. His Eminence then handed him the diploma of his degree, and the new doctor was assigned to his place among the doctors of theology present. In conclusion he delivered a brief discourse, in which he thanked the University and his professors for the aid and encouragement which he had constantly received from them.

ARCHBISHOP KEANE.

At the request of the Board of Directors of the University, the Holy Father has granted to Archbishop Keane a leave of absence from Rome, in order that he may devote himself to the work of completing the endowment of the University.

His vigorous enthusiasm, his high ideal of University work and life, his numerous devoted friends in every rank and calling, his winning manner and rare eloquence,—above all, his absolute unselfishness and spirit of self-sacrifice, make it sure that wherever he goes he will meet with no uncertain or hesitating response.

The University grows constantly in chairs, fellowships and scholarships. But all these moneys are pledged to specific purposes. What is needed is a large general fund for the numerous expenses outside of the endowed teaching, for the growth and care of laboratories, for necessary but unendowed teaching,—in a word, for the general management of the great “plant” which is increasing so rapidly and so solidly.

The Archbishop's work is in the nature of assistance to the Board of Directors and the administration of the University, and will be carried on in conjunction with the Rector.

May God inspire many generous hearts to coöperate with him and give of their superabundance to the completion of this highest effort of the Catholic Church along the line of education. In one year (1898) thirty-eight millions of dollars have been given to non-Catholic institutions of advanced learning. This year, by one act, a generous, high-souled lady endowed a Western university with an equal sum, thirty-eight millions. It is clear that in non-Catholic circles there is a hitherto unparalleled devotion to the cause of solid university teaching. Surely, the Catholic heart is not less generous, nor the Catholic mind less enlightened as to our needs. No moneys are so well spent as those given to education. No investments last so long, no enterprises express so permanently the will of the founder, as those of a high educational character. Here the finest, highest charity is made visible, tangible,—for the hardest bread to get is the bread of learning. In a sermon of 1530, quoted by Janssen, Luther said apropos of the Catholic education of the fifteenth century, that in those days “Every purse was open for churches and schools, and

the doors of these latter were widespread for the free reception of children who could almost be forced to receive the expensive training given within their walls."

The Catholic Church has not changed since then; in every country, when she is free, by a very necessity of her being, she aims at the highest development of the mind and the heart,—consequently at the most perfect system of education suited to the times. It is in this spirit that the University bespeaks from all friends and well-wishers a cordial and generous reception of its first rector and its beloved benefactor.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Report of the Proceedings of the Conference of Catholic Colleges.—

The University has issued a handsome volume of 200 pages entitled "Report of the First Annual Conference of the Association of Catholic Colleges of the United States, held in St. James' Hall, Chicago, April 12 and 13, 1899." This report contains the genesis of the movement, the history of its realization, the full text of the papers read and the discussions held during the two days of the Conference. Its perusal must awaken in every Catholic mind fresh zeal for superior scientific and religious education.

The Baccalaureate Sermon.—The Baccalaureate Sermon was preached this year on Sunday, June 3d, by Rev. Joseph F. Smith, S. T. L. ('97), assistant pastor of Holy Cross Church, New York City. The High Mass was sung by the Rt. Rev. Rector, assisted by Rev. William L. Sullivan, C. S. P., as deacon, and Rev. John Joseph Burke, C. S. P., as sub-deacon. At the conclusion of the Mass, the *Te Deum* was sung in thanksgiving for the blessings and encouragements that had fallen to the University's share during the scholastic year about to close.

Traveling Prelates from New Zealand.—During the spring several prelates from Oceania have visited the University. Most Rev. Thomas Joseph Carr, D. D., Archbishop of Melbourne, was deeply interested in the work of higher education as carried on within our walls. As a former professor of Maynooth, it was especially gratifying and inspiring to him, and the professors are very much bounden to His Grace for his kind words of approval and encouragement.

Rt. Rev. James Moore, D. D., Bishop of Ballarat, spent a few hours with us on his way to Rome. Three suffragans of our esteemed friend and well-wisher, Most Rev. Francis Mary Redwood, D. D., Archbishop of Wellington (New Zealand), were also guests for a time of the University. They were: Rt. Rev. George M. Lenihan, D. D., Bishop of Auckland; Rt. Rev. John I. Grimes, D. D., Bishop of Christ Church; Rt. Rev. Michael Verdon, D. D., Bishop of Dunedin.

It was not without emotion that the University welcomed within its walls distinguished scholars and missionaries from so far, men of so many merits and sacrifices. Nor was it without satisfaction that we recognized in all of them men of action, practical and vigorous in their views, and in thorough sympathy with the American Church.

Reception at Philadelphia to Dr. Shanahan.—Thursday evening, June 8, the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia gave a reception to Dr. Shanahan, in recognition of his distinguished services as Lecturer on Scholastic Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania during the winter and spring of 1898-1899.

Visit of Prof. Carra de Vaux.—Baron Carra de Vaux, a distinguished professor of Arabic at the Institut Catholique, Paris, visited the University early in June, and partook of the hospitality of the Rt. Rev. Rector. The latter charged him to express the sentiments of affection and sympathy which the Catholic University of America entertains for its foreign sisters, and particularly for the Institut Catholique of Paris. This M. de Vaux promised to do, and assured us in return of the sincere good-will entertained by all his colleagues towards our enterprise.

Faculty of Theology.—The officers of the Faculty of Theology elected for the next two years are as follows: Dean, V. Rev. Dr. Charles P. Grannan; Vice-Dean, V. Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shahan; Secretary, Rev. Dr. John T. Creagh; Member of the Senate, V. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan; Member of the Library Committee, V. Rev. Dr. Thomas Bouquillon.

Promotion of Rev. Dr. Creagh.—Rev. John T. Creagh, J. C. D., Assistant Professor of Canon Law, has been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. Dr. Creagh is a graduate of Boston College, a former student of St. John's Theological Seminary, Boston, and of the American College, Rome.

John J. Delany, Esq.—On April 21, John J. Delany, Esq., of New York City, delivered before the University a deeply interesting lecture on the Catholic Church as the Civilizer of Europe. A large and appreciative audience welcomed his appearance and applauded the excellent manner in which he treated his high theme. It was with sincere sorrow that we learned, since this event, of the very dangerous illness of Mr. Delany, and with equal pleasure that we hear of his probable recovery.

American College Alumni.—The annual reunion of the Alumni Association of the American College, Rome, was held in Philadelphia, May 17. Rev. Dr. Pace, who has held the position of Treasurer for the last two years, was elected President, and Rev. Dr. Shanahan Second Vice-President. The Association has at present a membership of two hundred, representing forty dioceses of the United States. The meeting for 1900 will be held in Rochester, N. Y.

Addition to St. Thomas' College.—In order to meet the needs of their growing community, the Paulist Fathers have been obliged, for the third time, to enlarge their building. Immediately after the departure of the

students for their summer home on Lake George, work was begun. The plans which the Superior, Father Deshon, has approved, include twenty-five additional rooms and more spacious apartments for the general community exercises. The work is proceeding rapidly and it will be finished by the end of September.

Faculty of Philosophy.—The biennial election of officers was held at the regular meeting in May, with the following result: Dean, Prof. Edward L. Greene; Vice-Dean, Prof. Maurice F. Egan; Secretary, Dr. Charles P. Neill; Deputies to the Academic Senate, Rev. Dr. John J. Griffin and Rev. Dr. Henry Hyvernât. Prof. Egan was re-elected as representative of the Faculty on the Library Committee. In accordance with a recent enactment of the Senate, the newly-elected officers assumed their respective duties at the close of the annual Commencement.

Rev. Dr. Rooker at Colgate.—The second James course of lectures before the Divinity School of Colgate University was closed on May 29 by Rev. Dr. Rooker, Lecturer in Ethics at the Catholic University. His subject was "The Ethics of Citizenship." After carefully analyzing the idea of obligation in general, his paper dealt with the formation of society and the import, for the individual, of social relations. The principles on which civil society is based were examined, and the duties of citizenship, especially under a republican form of government, were logically deduced.

Philological Association.—At the regular meeting of the Association, on May 8, Dr. Dunn read a paper on "The Romance Elements in Sanctae Silviae Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta; Dr. Bolling contributed a subsidiary article entitled "A Parallel between Greek and Sanskrit Syntax." The next meeting will take place on the second Monday in October.

Dr. Shanahan's Course at Philadelphia.—During the past year Dr. Edmund T. Shanahan delivered a course of twenty-five lectures on Mediaeval Philosophy to the graduate students of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. The lectures embraced fifty hours of graduate work including seminar, and were a part of the regular courses of the University. The first ten lectures dealt with the history of the sources, nature, development and culmination of the scholastic philosophy, being supplemented by a delineation of the chief thought tendencies and an extensive bibliography. The last fifteen lectures were special, detailing the mediæval views on epistemology, psychology, metaphysics, cosmology, anthropology, theodicy, ethics and æsthetics.

Ordinations at the University.—On June 9, Rt. Rev. Alfred Curtis, D.D. ordained to the Priesthood four students of St. Thomas' College, men

bers of the congregation of St. Paul: Rev. John M. Handly, Rev. John C. McCourt, Rev. John J. Burke and Rev. William L. Sullivan.

Bishop Curtis also ordained, on June 17, the following members of the Marist Society: Priests, Rev. H. George, Rev. C. Orphelin, Rev. C. Du-bray, Rev. J. B. Jungers, Rev. X. Lechner, Rev. P. Nast, Rev. H. Pèrennés; Deacons, Rev. C. M. Chambard, Rev. E. H. Derivas, Rev. P. Mc-Oscar; Subdeacons, Messrs. J. Dreyer and A. Millet.

The ordinations, on both occasions, took place in the Divinity Chapel.

Trinity College.—On June 21, ground was broken for the erection of the principal buildings of Trinity College. The site purchased by the Sisters of Notre Dame two years ago, at the junction of Michigan and Lincoln avenues, opposite the southern boundary of the Soldiers' Home Park, is in easy and direct communication with all parts of the city by means of the electric cars.

The College building proper will be 260 feet long, while the Convent, which is at right angles with it, will be about 80 feet in length.

The Church, a handsome gothic structure, is the gift of Miss Annie Leary, of New York. Its dimensions are 135 feet by 60 feet, and it will be connected with both Convent and College buildings by means of cloisters.

The material to be employed in the erection of the buildings is granite from the quarries of Port Deposit.

Much credit is due to the ladies of the Auxiliary Board of the College under their tactful and energetic president, Miss Risley Seward. The ladies of Boston, under the direction of Miss Emma Cary, have undertaken to provide the College Library, while the ladies of New York, with Mrs. Thomas Wrenn Ward at their head, are taking an active interest in the institution. An Art School, with an excellent collection of pictures, has also been promised, and scholarships are being founded.